LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 367--78th Congress

Chapter 296--2d Session

H. R. 4443

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 367 1

Index and Summary of History on H. R. 4443 4

Index to debate 5

Index to hearings 14

Appendix. Amendments, excerpts, letters, etc. 1A

PUBLIC LAW 367 - 78th CONGRESS

(H. R. 4443)

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes

With the exception of corporate funds, permanent appropriations lend-lease funds, and payments for services to other agencies, this Act carries most of the funds available to the Department.

Appropriations and reappropriations for the fiscal year 1945 total $734,428,628, a decrease of $321,113,290 compared with total 1944 appropriations and reappropriations. Four major items represent $296,781,000 of this decrease leaving a decrease of $24,332,290 in the remaining appropriations to the Department. These four major items of decrease (appropriated in 1944 but not continued in 1945 are:

$170,281,000 to liquidate the contract authorization for full parity payments on 1942 crops;

$9,000,000 appropriated in 1944 but applicable to 1943 for increased rates of payments to sugar producers for 1943 pursuant to Public Law 386, 77th Congress;

$97,500,000 net reduction in the AAA item in line with the Congressional limitation placed on the size and scope of the 1944 crop-year program;

$20,000,000 in appropriated funds for REA loans (the 1945 Act carries an RFC borrowing authorization in lieu thereof)

In addition to the appropriated funds, the Department is authorized to borrow $67,500,000 from RFC for FSA rural rehabilitation loans (same as 1944), $15,000,000 for farm tenancy loans (one-half the amount authorized for 1944), and $25,000,000 for REA loans, an increase of $5,000,000 over the 1944 appropriation.

The Act also includes $30,700,000 to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310, 9322, 9328, and 9334, and contains language prohibiting the use of any of these funds for promulgation or execution of war food orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural commodities, excepting walnuts.

The Act also prohibits the use of these funds for agricultural wage stabilization except in areas where a majority of producers request the intervention of the War Food Administrator.

The Act provides $350,000 in reappropriated funds for continuing liquidation of the crop-insurance program.

Funds for supervision and technical assistance by FSA in its rural rehabilitation program are reduced by $4,500,000 to $26,000,000, while administrative expenses for the farm-tenancy loan program remain about the same as 1944.

Water facilities in arid and semi-arid areas are provided for at the same level as in 1944.

The $421,039 provided in 1944 for liquidation and management of resettlement projects is eliminated in 1945, necessary expenses in connection therewith to be financed from trust funds and from the appropriation for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation.

$119,307,108 is available under the Section 32 permanent appropriation, an increase of $22,355,170 over 1944. The Act specifically authorizes the use of not to exceed $50,000,000 (same as 1944) of Section 32 funds for continuing a school lunch and milk program.

$1,750,000 is included in CCC's administrative expense authorization for the Dairy Production Payment Program.

$290,000,000 is provided under "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", the AAA item for the program of soil conservation and soil-building practice payments to farmers, a reduction of $110,000,000 below last year;

$12,500,000 additional is available for making incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes determined by the WFA Administrator to be necessary to provide an adequate supply of such seeds.

Administrative expenses for the AAA program are limited to $24,250,000, compared with $30,000,000 in 1944.

For the Emergency Rubber Project, $5,420,000 will be available in 1945 to put the project on a maintenance basis, including continuation of a curtailed research program.

The Soil Conservation Service receives $29,637,248, an increase of $5,792,112 above 1944 to provide expansion of soil-conservation operations: little change was made in the SCS research item.

Research and regulatory activities remain at approximately the same level as in 1944; some increases provided to meet special items include:

BAI, $995,384 for the reclassification of veterinarians and meat and livestock inspectors to appropriate salary grades and levels;
BPISAE, $12,500 for work on burley tobacco in North Carolina;
E&PQ, $30,000 for surveys and investigational work on spruce budworm and $25,000 for barberry eradication in the State of Washington;
BHNHE, $288,032 for developing better methods of home preservation of food;

FS, $17,500 for work in connection with control of the spruce budworm, $35,000 for chemical stimulation of trees in connection with naval stores production, $35,000 for studying utilization of southern hardwoods, and $35,000 for development of new and fuller utilization of forest resources in the Northeast.

The Forest Service was also provided with an increase of $729,472 for timber sales administration and $70,000 for work under the "sustained yield" Act (Public 273, approved March 29, 1944). Other Forest Service activities will continue at approximately the same level as in 1944.

No significant changes were made in the direct appropriations for the staff offices of the Department.

The Act contains the same restrictions as carried in 1944 on some phases of the RACC loan program.

The Act also carries language prohibiting the payment of salaries and other expenses to employees of the Department of Agriculture who are convitted of violating the Hatch Act , or who have been found to have violated or attempted to violate the Anit-Lobbying Act, or who have demanded that a farmer join the AAA program as a condition of draft deferment or for priority certificate.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. R. 4443

February 7, 1944	Hearings: House, H. R. 4443.
March 21, 1944	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 4443. House Report 1271. Committee print of the bill and print of the bill as reported.
March 22, 1944	House began debate.
March 23, 1944	Debate continued.
March 24, 1944	Debate concluded. Passed House with amendments.
March 28, 1944	Print of the bill as referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.
April 17, 1944	Hearings: Senate, H. R. 4443.
May 11, 1944	Amendment proposed by Senator Gurney.
May 16, 1944	Senate Committee reported H. R. 4443 with amendments. Senate Report 886. Print of the bill as reported.
May 17, 1944	Debated and passed Senate with amendments. Senate Conferees appointed. Print of the bill with the amendments of the Senate numbered.
May 18, 1944	House appointed Conferees.
June 6, 1944	House received Conference Report. House Report 1605.
June 14, 1944	House agreed to Conference Report and began consideration of items in disagreement.
June 19, 1944	House continued action on Conference Report.
June 20, 1944	Senate agreed to Conference Report and both houses acted on items in disagreement. Both houses asked for further conference. House and Senate Conferees appointed for 2d Conference.
June 22, 1944	Both houses agreed to 2d Conference Report. House Report 1714.
June 28, 1944	Approved. Public Law 367.
July 1, 1944	Budget and Finance Circular 764. Tables of Appropriations, 1945.

INDEX TO DEBATE

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION
Committeemen
Cards to farmers - 3035-39
Status - 3068-69
Criticism by:
Hoffman - 3078
Murray - 2985-90
Draft deferment - 2990; 3012; 3036; 3078; 3083
Farm machinery - 2990; 3036-41; 3083
Gasoline rationing - 2990; 3018; 3036-37; 3078; 3083; 4673-74
Payments to individuals limited to $500 - 3069-75
Political activity - 3035-40; 3068; 3083; 4661-75; 6370-83; 6561
Section 32 funds. See SECTION 32 FUNDS
Solicitor's opinion re: applicability of Hatch Act(quoted)- 6371
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
Budget estimate - 2978
Salary of administrator - 4658; 4680; 6009
AGRICULTURAL YEARBOOK - "Keeping Livestock Healthy"
Printing of - 3010
AMENDMENTS. See APPENDIX
APPROPRIATION
Distribution by functions - 3008
Permanent - 3008
Reduction in - 2977; 4660
AUCHTER, DR. E. C.
Commendation by Plumley - 2984

BANGS DISEASE
Eradicating - 2979; 3022-23; 6010
BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT
Also see: FARM TENANCY; FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
Appropriation, increase in - 4679
Explanation of purpose - 6385
BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER
Budget estimate - 2980
Building construction - 4659
BENNETT, DR. HUGH H.
Commendation by:
Dirksen - 3008
Plumley - 2984-85
BLACK, DR. A. G.
Letter to Murray re: interest on long-term mortgage - 2989
BUILDINGS
BA&IC - 6306
BPI - Houma, La. - 6302
Construction and alterations, expenditures for - 4659

BUREAUS OF:

Agricultural Economics
- Budget estimate - 2978
- Criticism of - 2978
- Economic investigations - 4658
- Personal services in D. C. - 4658
- Salary of Director - 4680; 6009

Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry
- Citrus fruit experimentation - 2979
- Building construction and alterations - 4659; 6306

Animal Industry
- Budget estimate - 2979
- Building construction - amendment deleting comma - 4658
- Hog cholera - marketing agreements - 3022; 4658
- Inspection and quarantine - 4658; 3022
- Livestock diseases, etc. - 3019-20; 3023-29; 4658; 6010-12
- Meat inspection - 3022; 4658
- Salary increases:
  - Field employees - 2979; 3026; 6301
  - Veterinarians et al - 3019; 3020; 3023-29; 4658 (under BAI) - cd 3 6010-12; 6300-01
- Verus Serum Toxin Act - 4658; 3022

Dairy Industry
- Budget estimate - 2979
- Cheese industry - 3020-21
  - Dehydrating work - 2985
- Herd improvements - 2985
- Plumley's comment on work of Bureau - 2985

Entomology and Plant Quarantine
- Budget estimate - 2979
- Barberry eradication - 4659; 6303
- Citrus canker eradication amendment - 4659
- Foreign parasites - 4659

Human Nutrition and Home Economics
- Budget estimate - 2979
- Research in home problems - 3029
- Salaries and expenses - 3029
- Taber's amendment reducing funds - 3029

Plant Industry, Soils & Agricultural Engineering
- Agricultural engineering investigations - 4658
- Budget estimate - 2979
- Building construction - 4658
  - Houma, La. - 6302
- Cereal crops and diseases investigation - 4658
- Dry land agriculture investigations - 4659
- Fruit and vegetable crop disease investigations - 4659
- Plant exploration, etc., investigation - 4659
- Soil surveys - 2979; 4659
- Tobacco investigations - 4659

COOLEY BILL - 2982; 6384; 6385
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION
Administrative expenses - 2983; 4661
Budget estimate - 2981
Capital restoration - 2981; 2983
Dirksen's comment - 3010
Hutson's statement re: potatoe situation - 3034
Parity prices for middling cotton, method of determining-4661;6306
Potatoe situation; incentive payments, subsidy program;parity-3034
Wheat imports - 3017
CONFERENCE REPORTS
June 6, 1944 - H. Report 1605 - 5507
June 20, 1944 - 6356
June 22, 1944 - H. Report 1714 - 6561
June 22, 1944 - 6624
CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES
AAA payments - Ree's amendment limiting to $500 - 3069-75
AAA transfer of funds to "Administrative expense account"- 4661
Budget estimate - 2981
Farming practices - making funds available thru 1946 - 4661
General provisions - 3035
Incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes - 4661; 6009; 6306
Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops - 4684; 6306
~~Law book purchases~~, etc. - 4661; 4681
Relation of functions to SCS - Ree's comment - 3070
Sec. 32 funds - 4681
CORPORATIONS, GOVERNMENT
Dirksen's comment - 3010
CORRECTION
Harness amendment - 3067
CROP INSURANCE.See FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

DAIRY AND POULTRY
Cheese industry - 2985; 3020-21
Maximum prices, etc. - 3020-21
Market news - 3076; 3079
DUTCH ELM DISEASE - 3029
DRAFT DEFERMENT
AAA policy - 2990; 3012; 3036-41; 3083-84
Harness amendment - 3035; 3041; 3067; 3083-84

EMERGENCY CROP LOANS
Combining with FSA - 2978; 2982
EMERGENCY EROSION CONTROL, EVERGLADES REGION, FLORIDA
Budget estimate - 2982
EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECTS. See GUAYULE
EXCERPTS. See APPENDIX
EXTENSION SERVICE
Budget estimate - 2978

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION
Budget estimate - 2983
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation
Administrative expenses - 2982
Tarver's favorable comment - 2982
Federal Land Banks - 2989
FARM MACHINERY
AAA compliance - 2990; 3036-41
Allocation of material - 3016; 3076-77
Harness amendment - 3083-84
Manufacture of - 3007
Quota - AAA compliance - 2990
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
Also see: FARM TENANCY; LOANS, GRANTS AND RURAL REHABILITATION
Administrative expenses - 6307; 6384
Appropriation - 4719; 6009
Communistic charges - 6385
Continuation - 2977; 4678; 4719; 6384
Criticism by:
Lamberton - 6384
Taber - 6387
Farm tenant land purchase program
Budget estimate - 2982
Reduction in funds - 2978
Status - 6384-89
Land acquisition - 4679; 6384; 6387; 6388; 6389
Little dams project - 4680
Liquidation of projects - 2982; 4679; 6385; 6388
Loans:
Authorized - 6386; 6388
Repaid - 6387
Medical care - 6385; 6386
Operation generally - 6386
Personnel - 3009; 4679
Political activity - 6387
Protecting investments - 2983
RFC funds - 6307; 6384; 6386
FARM TENANCY
Also see FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
Loans - 4679
Salary and expenses - 4679; 6389
Water facilities, etc. - 4679
FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE
Dirksen's comment - 3009
Liquidation of program - 2981; 4678
FEDERAL SEED ACT
Amendment - labels on containers; offered by Guerney - 4379

FOREST SERVICE
Budget estimate - 2980
Cooperative farm forestry - 3032
Forest economics investigation - 4659
Forest-fire cooperation and control - 2980; 3030-32; 4660; 4681; 6306; 6357
Forest products - experiments and tests - 4659
Funds - 3008
Post-war planning - 4681
Range investigation - 4659; 4683
Research programs - 3018-19; 3031-32
Roads and trails - 3032
Salaries and expenses - 3030-32; 4659; 6009-10
Tax laws, study of - 4659
Timber insurance, study of - 4659
Tree planting, etc. - 3031-32
GASOLINE RATIONING
AAA policy - 2990; 3012; 3018; 3036-41; 3083; 4673
Harness amendment3035; 3041; 3067; 3083-84
GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS
Dirksen's recommendation for investigation - 3010
GUAYULE
Anderson's speech in support of - 3012-14
Eisenhower's report and recommendation on production of - 3013-14; 6365; 6369
Liquidation of projects - 2980; 3009-10; 3034-35; 4660; 6363-70
Production by farmers - 3034-35
Record vote on amendment - 6369
Research - 3012-14
HEMP
Wartime experiment - 2980
INCENTIVE PAYMENTS
Committee amendment - 4661
Lobbying activities - 3068
Potatoes - 3034
Prohibiting except for certain ones - 6306
Seeds of grasses and legumes - 6009; 6306

LAND ACQUISITION
Cooley's criticism - 6387
Dirksen's criticism - 3011
FSA - 4679; 6384; 6387; 6388; 6389
LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND
Budget estimate - 2982
School milk and lunch program - 4678; 6307
LETTERS. See APPENDIX
LIBRARY
Appropriation - 2978

LIVESTOCK
Eradication of diseases - 3022-23; 3028-29; 6010
Market news - 3077-79
Notice of OPA re: slaughtering houses - 3040
Research in range problems, etc. - 3018-19
LOANS, GRANTS AND RURAL REHABILITATION
Amendment - action postponed - 6307-08
Budget estimate - 2982
Decrease in funds - 6383-89
Explanation of provision - 4678-79
Liquidation of rural rehabilitation projects - 4679; 6385; 6388
Work requirements of recipients of grants - 4679
LOBBYING. See POLITICAL ACTIVITY
LUMBER
Lumber situation - 3019

MANPOWER
Farming - 2982; 3077
Farm machinery - 2990
Lumber industry - 3019
Packing plants - 3079
MARKET NEWS SERVICE
Budget estimate - 2982
Fruit and vegetables - 3077
Funds - 4678
Livestock - 3077-79
Poultry and dairy products - 3076; 3079
MEMORANDA. See APPENDIX

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
Cheese - 3020-21
Livestock - 3079
Gasoline rationing - 4674
OFFICE OF:
Experiment Stations
Budget estimate - 2978
Foreign Agricultural Relations
Budget estimate - 2978
Information
Budget estimate - 2978
Printing and binding, change in designation of Act - 4658
Secretary
Budget estimate - 2978
Salaries and expenses - 6008
Solicitor
Budget estimate - 2978
Funds - 4658
Solicitor's opinion on applicability of Hatch Act(quoted)-6371
PACE BILL
School lunch - 2982; 3017; 6388
Status - 6384; 6385

PAPER
Expenditures by different departments - 3010
PARITY PAYMENTS
Gossett's comment favoring - 3017
Middling cotton - method of determining - 6306
Potatoes - 3034
Reduction in - 4660
Status of appropriation - 2978; 2981
Table - 2985
PERSONNEL
AAA County Committeemen, status - 3068-69
FSA, reduction in - 4679
Full-time employees - 3008; 3068-69
Reductions in - Dirksen's criticism - 3008-09
SCS - table - 3021-22
Total number in Department - 3008
PEST CONTROL
Corn borers - 2982
Funds for - 2982
Worms - 2983
POST-WAR PLANNING
Forestry - reforestation, fire control, etc. - 4681-83
Private enterprise - 4681
POINTS OF ORDER
AAA payments - limiting to $500(Ree's amendment) overruled - 3069
Political activity amendment (Harness) overruled - 3035-36
Political activity amendment(Committee) sustained - 4663
Post-war planning for forestry (Chavez amendment) sustained - 4683
REA - financing generating plants, etc., in places having population in excess of 1500, etc. (Boren amendment) - overruled - 3080-81
Quorum - 3083; 6010; 6011; 6302; 6304; 6369; 6384
POLITICAL ACTIVITY
AAA employees et al; lobbying - 3035-37; 3068; 4661-75; 6370-83;6561
Applicability of amendment - 3068-69
Cochran amendment - 3068-69
Danaher modification of amendment - deleting "making or", "full-time"; inserting "June 1, 1944"" - 4669
FSA administrators - 6387
Incentive payments - 3068
Solicitor's opinion on applicability of Hatch Act (quoted) - 6371-83
Substitute language - 6625
Subcommittee amendment, history of - 6371
PRINTING AND BINDING
Reductions in funds - 3010

QUESTION PERIOD
Cabinet members and heads of Government agencies appearing before Congress periodically for questioning - 3014-16

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION
Funds to REA - 4680; 6383; 6388
RECORD VOTE
AAA political activity prohibition - (123-219) - 6382
Barberry eradication - (188-132) - 6305
Harness amendment prohibiting demands that persons join AAA - (171-135) - 3083-84
Liquidation of guayule projects (299-43) - 6370
Veterinarians' reclassification - (255-80) - 6302
REED, Dr. O. E.
Commendation by Plumley on his work - 2984-85
REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION
Combining with other agencies - 2978; 2982; 4679
Nonrecourse loans handled by FSA - 6388
REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES
Building construction and alterations - 4659
Work of - 2979
REPORTS. See APPENDIX
RESEARCH, AGRICULTURAL
Forestry - 3031
Forest lands products - wood, forage, etc. - 3018-19
Funds - 3008; 4661
Home problems - 3029
Hill's favorable comment - 3018
Indian reservations - 3076
Livestock industry - 3018-19
Plumley's favorable comment - 2984-85
Rubber - 3012-14. Also see GUAYULE
Soil practices, moisture, etc. - 3072
Water - 3018
Work of Research Laboratories - 2979
RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS
Liquidation and management - 2982; 4679; 6385; 6388
RUBBER. See GUAYULE
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION
Budget estimate - 2983
Deficiency appropriation - 6008
Engineers of American Republics, employment of - 3079-80
Financing generating plants, etc., in places with population in excess of 1500 - 3080-83
Financing electrification to persons now receiving central service - 3080-83
Financial and credit reports - 4679
Funds from RFC - 4680; 6384; 6389
General provisions - 3078-80
Salaries and expenses - 3079

SALARIES
BAI employees - 2979
Chiefs of FS, BAE, and ARA - 4680; 6009
Office of Secretary, reduction in - 6008
Veterinarians, lay assistants, meat inspectors - 3019-20; 3023-29; 6010-12; 6300-01
SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM
Abolishing - 2989
Amendment
Committee - 4678
History of action on - 6388
Bolton's comment favoring program - 3017-18
Continuing - 2982; 4719
History and set-up of program - 3017-18
Pace bill language substituted; providing $50,000,000 - 6307
Sec. 32 funds - 2977; 4678; 6307
Status - 2977; 2982
Tarver's aomment - 2982; 6388
SECTION 32 FUNDS
Irish potatoe and commercial truck crops - 4684
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources - 2981; 4681
School lunch program - 2977; 4678; 6307
Soil conservation payments - 4661
SEED
Farm seed - 6009; 6306
Seeds of grasses and legumes, harvesting - 6009; 6306
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE
Budget estimate - 2981
Dirksen's favorable comment - 3008
Drainage and irrigation work - 2981-82
Machinery and equipment - 2982
Payments - 3069-75; 4660; 4678
Personnel - 3021-22
Plumley's favorable comment - 2984-85
Research on Indian reservations - 3076
Soil programs - 3021
State agency approval on SCS agreements - 3075; 4678
Table showing funds expended - 3022
Tree planting - 3032
Work of - 3069-75
Soybeans
Ceiling price - 3017
STATEMENTS. See APPENDIX
SUBSIDIES
Dismissals for criticising - 3069
Murray's comment - 2985-89
Political activity - 4674
Potatoes - 3034
SUGAR ACT
Budget estimate - 2982

TABLES. See APPENDIX

TOLLEY, H. R.
Salary - 4680; 6009
TRAVEL
Intermittent employees of WFA - 4680; 6306
TUBERCULOSIS
Eradicating - 2979; 6300

VEHICLES
Purchases by WFA - 3660
VETERANS
Rehabilitation loans - 6009
VETERINARIANS. See BAI

WAGE STABILIZATION
Anderson's amendment - 3033-34
Farm wages - 2980; 3660-61; 4661
Dirksen's criticism - 3009; 3033-34
WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION
Assessments for cost of administrative food orders - 2980; 3032-33; 3078
Automobile purchases - 4660
Budget estimate - 2980
Criticism of Administrator's letter in answer to query of Rep. Murray re: War Meat Board's slaughtering order - 2990
Draft deferment authority - 2990
Salary and expenses - 3032
Travel of intermittent employees - 4680 - 6306
Wage stabilization project - 2980; 3009; 3033-34; 4660
WATER
Research in development - 3019
WATER FACILITIES-ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS
Budget estimate - 2982
Funds for - 4679-80
WHEAT
Imports from Argentine, etc. - 3017
WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL
Budget estimate 2980

Agriculture Department
Appropriation Bill for 1945
Hearings before the Sub-Committee of the
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives
Seventy-eighth Congress
second session

Selective Index

Agricultural Adjustment Administration
page 60 -Defining "federal employees"
63 -Included in agency whose employees decreased between June-Dec.'43
90 -Lambertson calls AAA useless at this time
952 -Farmer interest in AAA programs
954 -AAA conservation program not involved in subsidy fight
1466-86-Farm Bureau's part in AAA organization
1487-9 -Farm Bureau's connections with AAA
1489-92-Farm Bureau's part and interest in AAA
See also: Agricultural Conservation Program

Agricultural Conservation Program
page 937-9-Plan for apportioning administrative expenses among counties
940-1-Desire to get on fiscal year basis
949 -Comparison of Northern and Southern Division organizations
952 -Farmer interest in soil conservation

Agricultural Yearbook
page 18-20 -Tarver says Department isn't following Congress' wish to print Yearbook
135-8 -Salisbury and Tarver discuss printing of Yearbook

Allies
page 98-UNRRA will be responsible for foods to allies
See also: Lend-lease

American Farm Bureau Federation
page 1466-86-Interest and recommendations to Department
1487-9 -Connections with AAA and FSA, etc.

Mr. Aopleby
page 720-His relations with BEA

Agricultural Appropriations
Appropriation Bill for 1945
Hearings before the Sub-Committee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives
Seventy-eighth Congress
Second session

Subjects Index

Agricultural Adjustment Administration

page 50 -Including 'Federal employees'
63 -Included in agency whose employees compensated between Dec.-Jan.,'43
90 -Lumberjacks could join Union at this time
92 -Farmer interest in the programs
94 -All conservation programs not involved in subsidy fight
1416-20-Farm Bureau's part in the organization
1427-9 -Farm Bureau's association with AAA
1429-30-Farm Bureau's part and interest in AAA
See also: Agricultural Conservation Program

Agricultural Conservation Program

page 93-Plan for supplying soil/fertilizer expenses among counties
94-1-Having to get on direct year basis
94 -Comparison of farmers and Indians fertilizer expenditures
92 -Farmer interest in soil conservation

Agricultural Laborer

page 16-20 -Farmer and Department Sec's following Congress' vote to grant farmhand
170-4 -Salisbury and Tarver discuss picketing of farmhand

Alfalfa

page 96-Meals will be rationally for foods to alfalfa
See also: Lend-Lease

American Farm Bureau Federation

page 1416-20-Interest and recommendations to Department
1427-9 -Connections with AAA and FSA, etc.

T. Amidby

page 178-Its relations with Ex

Authority
Of the Department concerning program
page 23 -Mixed feed and egg prices
3 -Farm machinery and equipment
4 -Foreign farm labor
5 -Dairy farmer in Southeast
15 -Cotton farmer
18-20-Reprinting 1942 Yearbook
954 -The farmer
Between agencies in the Department
91 -President, OPA and Secretary
618-9 -Claim FCA should close some unused banks
684-7 -Question Slattery's authority and work
706-7 -Wickard had no authority to oust Slattery
1139ff -Questions O of D's legal right to tax dairy handlers
1255 -Powers of CCC
Between Department and other agencies
23-6-WFA and OPA - mixed feed
143 -WFA and WPB regarding farm machinery
716--Wickard has lost power to OPA and WFA, etc.
759 -WPB and WFA
791 -WFA should have charge of fish for food
838 -OES gave WFA power to approve salary increases
Between Department and War Food Administration
2 -Secretary and WFA
34 -Department and WFA
97 -Department and WFA
109-16 -Secretary and WFA
See Also: Relations

Banks
See Loans

Mr. Baxter
page 862-Legality of Facilities Security Activities

Mr. Black
page 612-Says financial conditions of agriculture have improved
616-Report on outstanding loans in FCA

Budget
page 2 -Budget drawn presuming war will last through 1945
30 -Department budget estimate reduced
60 -Define "federal employees"
63 -Decrease of 30,000 employees between June-Dec. 1943
69 -Items carried from year to year without legal authorization
90 -Department activities and personnel cut as far as possible
704-5 -Slattery knows nothing of the budget
838 -OES gave WFA power to approve increased salaries
940-1 -A fiscal year basis to facilitate getting appropriations for AC
1281 -Questions legal use of CCC funds

Bureau of Agricultural Economics
page 142-Tolley defines BAE's work

Appendix

[illegible] of the Government Economic Program

page 2] -Fiscal food and drug policy
3 -Farm mechanization and [illegible]
4 -Foreign Exchange Laws
5 -Daily Labor in Guyana
15 -Cotton farmer
16-20-Exploiting [illegible] farmers
25A -The farmer

Between [illegible] in the Government

31 -Freedom, [illegible] and democracy
[illegible] -Claim [illegible] should place [illegible] based
[illegible] -Question Military's authority and [illegible]
[illegible] -Widened [illegible] authority in [illegible] Ministry
[illegible] -Questions C of E's legal right to [illegible] treaties
[illegible] -Powers of [illegible]

Between Government and other organs

[illegible] and [illegible] - [illegible] Fund
[illegible] -[illegible] and [illegible] regarding [illegible] Ministry
[illegible] -Minister has local power in [illegible] and [illegible], etc.
[illegible] - [illegible] and [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] should have [illegible] of [illegible] for [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] gives [illegible] power to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Between Government and for [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] -Secretary and [illegible]
[illegible] -Government and [illegible]
[illegible] -Government and [illegible]
[illegible] -Secretary and [illegible]
[illegible] Minister [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Loans

[illegible]. Budget

page [illegible]-Legality of Statutory Monetary Authority

[illegible]. Stamp

page [illegible]-Pure financial conditions of Corporation Site [illegible]
[illegible]-Report on [illegible] issues in [illegible]

Budget

page [illegible] -Budget [illegible] presented not will last [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -Government Budget [illegible] reduced
[illegible] -Calling [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -Increase of [illegible] [illegible] between [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -Items carried from year to year without legal authorization
[illegible] -Government activities and personnel [illegible] [illegible] possible
[illegible] -Statutory [illegible] of the Budget
[illegible] -[illegible] gives [illegible] power to approve increased [illegible]
[illegible] -A fixed year basis to facilitate getting approximations for [illegible]
[illegible] -Questions legal use of [illegible] funds

[illegible] of Institutions Involved

page [illegible]-Policy [illegible] [illegible]'s work

Bureau of Home Economics
See Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics
page 1306-22-Asking additional funds for work with Home Economics Association

Cattle
See Livestock

Ceilings
page 1274-Cotton ceilings considered

Civilian food
See Food

Commodity Credit ~~Administration~~ corporation
page 1255-Powers of CCC discussed by Shields and Plumley
1281-Legality of CCC's use of funds questioned by Tarver

Control
See Crop Control, Federal Control

Coops
See Farm Coop project

Cotton
page 1274-Ceilings considered

Mr. Craig
page 737-Plumley questions his reason for resigning

Crop Control
page 1476-Farm Bureau gives recommendations

Crop Insurance
See Federal Crop insurance

Dairy and Poultry
page 5-7 -Charges Department is not helping Dairy farmer in Southeast
6 -Dairy industry in Southeast
23-6 -Department is not backing egg program it started
149-54 -Tolley says Dairying profitable; Congressmen take exception
1139ff,1154ff-Questions O of D's legal right to collect tax from dairy handlers
1191ff -Jones explains method of milk distribution in lieu of rationing
1201 -Tells how milk industry agreed to cooperate with plan

Distribution
See Office of Distribution

Grades of Cane Sugarcane
See Grades of Cane Sugarcane and Cane Sugarcane

Grades of Cane Sugarcane and Cane Sugarcane
Page 1[illegible]-Grading specifications Grade for sugar with cane Sugarcane Investigation

Grits
See Livestock

Grillers
Page 1[illegible]-Broiler chicken grillers

Grinding Feed
See Feed

Gubernatorial Grants [illegible]
Page 1[illegible]-Grants of [illegible] dispensed by Governor and Congress
1[illegible]-Legality of [illegible]'s use of funds [illegible] by Congress

Guatemala
See Corn Control, Tobacco Control

Guava
See Guava Cane project

Guinea
Page 1[illegible]-Guinea [illegible]

Gum Arabic
Page 1[illegible]-Tariff questions and reason for requesting

Gum Copal
Page 1[illegible]-Gum Copal gives [illegible]

Gum Copal
See Natural Gum Copal Laboratory

Gulf and Coastal
Page 5-7 -Coastal Experiment in net halting Gulf Coast in Louisiana
8 -Gulf Laboratory in Montauk
11-6 -Experiment in net hauling egg program is started
16-19 -Gulf Coast [illegible] production Experiment [illegible]
11[illegible]-Gulf Coast [illegible] 0 of U's legal right to collect tax from Gulf Coast
Longline
11[illegible] -Issue regulation method of milk distribution in line of [illegible]
1[illegible] -Gulf Coast milk [illegible] expense in [illegible]

Gulf[illegible]
See Office of Gulf[illegible]

Mr. Dodd
page 937-9-Gives his plan for apportioning ACP funds among counties
940-1-Says they would like to be on a fiscal year basis
949 -Describes difference between Northern and Southern setups
952 -Farmer interest in soil conservation and AAA
954 -AAA conservation program not involved in subsidy fight

Mr. Ekern
page 1507-24-Speaks on Federal Crop Insurance

Extension
page 60 -Employees not "federal" since paid by state
995-Says the same person should have charge of different phases of FSA and cooperate with Extension Service

Facilities Security
page 862-4-Questions set up legality of FS

Farm Bureau
See American Farm Bureau Federation

Farm Coop project
page 981-Lists 13 farm coop projects
987-Differences between these and individual farm units

Farm Credit Administration
page 63 -Decrease in employees between June and December 1943
611 -Does not expect WFA to renew loans for FCA (BACC)
616 -Amount of loans being paid back each year
618-9 -FCA should use authority in terminating unused banks
1478 -Farm Bureau gives recommendations for FCA
See also: FCA

Farm Machinery
page 3 -WFA responsibility for farm machinery and equipment
142 -BAE studies what Agriculture could do with more machinery
143 -WFA and WPB know cause for lag in delivery of farm machinery
756-8 -Jones discusses farm machinery, etc.
759 -Jones tells of authority of WPB and WFA over farm machinery
817 -Views concerning availability of farm machinery
1481 -Farm Bureau's suggestions regarding farm machinery

Farm program
page 1469-Farm Bureau's suggestions regarding farm program

Farm Security Administration
page 63 -Decrease in employees between June and December 1943
90 -Against continuing FSA, Lambertson
960 -Hancock's list of policy actions in his 3 months in office
994 -Eligibility requirements for loans or renewals exclude those who have been on for 5 years and have not repaid 50%
1472 -Farm Bureau gives recommendations for FSA
1487-9 -Farm Bureau's connections with FSA
1505-6 -Letters concerning Cooperative Projects. FSA introduced by Tarver

Farm Bureau

page 37-Bureau's 5-year plan for organizing and training young people
40-Bureau may would like to be on a fiscal year basis
49 -Describes differences between Farmers and Southern Farmers
52 -Bureau interest in soil conservation and AAA
54 -AAA conservation program not involved in subsidy fight

Farm Bureau

page 107-Bureau on Federal Jury legislation

Farmers

page 50 -Employees not "federal" since paid by state
55-says the same person should have charge of different phases of
AAA and cooperate with Extension service

Farmers Security

page 55-Bureau for security of 55

Farm Bureau

See American Farm Bureau Federation

Farm Corp Project

page 94-Lists 17 farm corp projects
97-Differences between these and individual farm units

Farm Credit Administration

page 65 -Purpose in employer between June and December 1937
67 -Does not present FCA to make loans for FCA (FSCA)
68 -Amount of loans being paid back each year
69-70 -FCA should use authority to terminate annual loans
1972 -Farm Bureau gives recommendations for 1937
See also: FCA

Farm Machinery

page 2 -AAA responsibility for farm machinery and equipment
142 -AAA studies what agriculture could do with farm machinery
143 -AAA and not know cause for lag in delivery of farm machinery
150-4 -Lines discussed farm machinery, etc.
152 -Lines failure of authority of AAA and AA over farm machinery
157 -Views concerning availability of farm machinery
160 -Farm Bureau's suggestions regarding farm machinery

Farm program

page 1463-Farm Bureau's suggestions regarding farm program

Farm Security Administration

page 63 -Increase in employees between June and December 1941
90 -Against continuing FSA, independent
90a -Bureau's list of other agencies in the 3 months in office
94a -Eligibility requirements for loans or grants exclude those who have been on for 5 years and have not repaid 50% of
1472 -Farm Bureau gives recommendations for FSA
1473-a -Farm Bureau's conceptions also FSA
1505-6 -Letters concerning Cooperative Projects. FSA interviews by Farmer

Farm tenancy
page 975-Congress' policy regarding Farm tenant land purchase loans
978-Table giving loans by states
987-Differentiates between coop project and individual farm units
991-No government funds are used to lease land
994-Eligibility for new and renewed loans
995-Administration limitation of $12000
1476-Farm Bureau recommends to the Department

Farm woodland
page 559-60-Value of farm woodland marketing assistance work

Farmer's Bulletin
page 133-Distribution not according to need

Federal Control
page 564 -Lambertson objects to Federal control of forests
1162-7 -Decentralization of meat inspection payroll offices

Federal Crop Insurance
page 1470 -Farm Bureau recommends to Department ~~payroll offices~~
1507-24-Ekern discusses Federal Crop Insurance

Feed
page 23-6-Responsibility for mixed feed prices and checking differential

Fertilizer
page 142 -BAE studies what agriculture could do with more fertilizer
143 -WPB and WFA responsibilities in distributing fertilizer
756-8 -Jones discusses Department's program regarding fertilizer

Fish
page 791-Plumley thinks WFA should have charge of fish for food

Food
page 98 -UNRRA will be responsible for food to Allies
158 -Percentages of food for civilians, lend lease, etc., 1942-3
756-8 -Food allocation figures discussed
823 -Hutson says WFA says we should slaughter cattle now
842-3 -Functions of O of D and assignments of allocations
852 -Civilian requirements and distribution
854 -Food distribution in war plants (in-feeding)
1157 -School lunch program
1191ff-Jones explains method of milk distribution in lieu of rationing
1201 -Cooperation of milk industry in tax payment in lieu of rationing

Forests
See National forests; see also: Farm woodland

Mr. Granger
page 570-Defends continuation of Guayule projects

Farm tenancy
page 17-Landowners' policy regarding farm tenant land purchase loans
97-Farm credit loans by states
97-Differentiation between farm renters and tenants
101-Is permanent tenant are used to take land
104-Eligibility for new and renewed loans
99-Administration limitation of 1930
1-17-Farm Bureau recommends to the department

Farm mortgages
page 39-40-Value of farm mortgages maturing maintenance work

Farmer's Bulletin
page 113-Distribution and advertising in area

Federal Control
page 36 -Independent objects in Federal control of forests
1182-7 -Nonmarketability of meat inspection

Federal Crop Insurance
page 1470 -Farm Bureau recommends to department ~~crop~~ insurance officer
1507-34-Farm discusses Federal Crop Insurance

Feed
page 17-6-Responsibility for other feed prices and operating/distribution

Fertilizer
page 112 -Has studies what agriculture could do with more fertilizer
147 -NFB and NFA responsibilities in distributing fertilizer
17-6 -Farm discusses Department's program regarding fertilizer

Fish
page 1-1-Fishing things ITA should have charge of fish for food

Food
page 98 -USDA will be responsible for food to cities
150 -Percentages of food for civilians, land leads, etc., 1940-7
158-8 -Food distribution figures discussed
827 -Indian says NFA says he should distribute outside sys
840-7 -Functions of O of I are explanations of allocations
836 -Certain requirements and distribution
838 -Food distribution in our plants (in-freezing)
1157 -School lunch program
1192-12-Farm equalizes method of city distribution in time of rationing
1201 -Cooperation of city industry in war payment to time of rationing

Forests
See National Forests; see also: Farm woodland

Fr. Germany
page 170-Defends conditions of Danish prisoners

Guayule
page 127-30-Need of continuing guayule program to finish it
570 -Questions concerning continuation of guayule program

Mr. Hamilton
page 749-51-Explains the RFA-Slattery situation

Mr. Hancock
page 960-Lists his policy actions for 3 months in FSA office
979,995-Gives limitation provision in FSA appropriation act
937-Describes cooperative projects and individual farm units
991-Says no government funds are used to lease land from others
994-Eligibility for loans and re-loans

Miss Harris
page 1306-22-Asks for additional funds for cooperating with Home Economics Association

Mr. Hill
page 826-9-Describes setup for stabilizing wages of agricultural labor
835 -Describes local farmers' committees which set wage rates
838 -Delegation by OPA of power to increase salaries by WFA
839 -Describes his own agricultural background

Home Economics
See Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics

Mr. Hutson
page 823-Says WFA says to slaughter livestock now

In-feeding
page 854-Work with Food distribution at war plants
See also: School lunch

Insurance
See Federal Crop Insurance

Mr. Johnson
page 1487-9-Farm Bureau's connections with AAA and FSA, etc.

Mr. Jones
page 756-8 -Reports on food allocations by WFA
759 -Describes authority of WFB and WFA
764 -Prefers to use United States than foreign agricultural labor
778 -Does not comment on whether RFC subsidies should be under WFA
785 -Describes cooperation with OPA
789 -Mentions possible disagreement between Department and OPA regarding livestock prices, but refuses to comment further
1191ff-Explains method of milk distribution in lieu of rationing

Amendments

page 147-70-8000 of existing security program to state it
170 -Describes procedural evaluation of security program

Mr. Dwyer

page 179-Explains the FDA-history situation

Mr. Hagner

page 310-States his policy reviews for 3 months in FDA offices
319,325-Gives illustrations provided in FDA appropriation and
321-Describes cooperative projects and individual farm units
331-Says no government funds are used to lease land from private
332-Responsibility for local and re-issues

Miss Gerth

page 172-Asks for additional funds for cooperating with home economics associations

Mr. Hill

page 228-Describes ending for establishing wages of agricultural labor
275 -Describes local farmers' committees which set wage rates
276 -Explanation by DOT of power to increase wages by FSA
279 -Describes his own agricultural background

Miss Dworzak

Has Bureau of Home Economics and Home Economics

Mr. Adams

page 223-Says FDA says to slaughter livestock now

In-Trading

page 474-Work with Dual distribution at new plants
See also: Federal funds

Amendment

See Tenant Corp Lackawaxen

Mr. Jones

page 171-Farm Bureau's connection with 4-H and FFA, etc.

Mr. Ivers

page 75-5 -Reports on loan withdrawals by FCA
75 -Describes authority of FCA and CCC
76 -Describes to what United States Treasury Department loans
77 -Does not account to whether CCC subsidiaries should be under FCA
78 -Describes conflicting with CCC
79 -Testifies possible disagreement between Department and CCC regarding Tiverton plans, but refuses to comment further
119/12-Explains method of milk distribution in lieu of rationing

Mr. Jones

page 18-20-Says it is up to Joint Committee on Printing when Agriculture Yearbook should be printed

34 -Cooperation between Department and WFA

69 -Items carried year after year which are not authorized by law

109-16-Office set-up of Secretary and WFA and OLUC and personnel

684-7-Mr. Slattery's authority and work in WFA

720 -Mr. Appleby's relations with WFA

731-2-Situation with dual Deputy Administrators of WFA

Mr. Kotok

page 559-60-Value of farm woodland marketing assistance work

Labor

page 4 -WFA has responsibility for foreign farm labor

142 -BAE makes studies of what agriculture could do with more labor

756-8 -Jones reports on imported labor

764 -Jones prefers to use United States to foreign labor

828-9 -Explains setup for stabilizing agricultural labor's wages

835 -Local farmers' committees which set wage rates

839 -Table showing numbers of farmers, etc. receiving $2500 and up

Mr. Lambertson

page 91 -Since President is responsible for OPA, ~~so~~ Secretary cannot have last word over OPA

564 -Objects to Federal control of forests

612-3 -Against continuing under FCA. FCA now

618-9 -Questions FCA's negligence in closing unused banks

622 -Government money crowding little banks to the wall

632 -Thinks FCA useless now

716 -Wickard's powers removed to OPA, WFA, etc. President OKed Slattery's removal, Comments Slattery's view on insurance company's plan

718 -Against "advisors to president" without desks

720 -Mr. Appleby's relations with WFA

954 -Says the farmers feel the Department is not helping them

1162-7--Decentralization of meat inspection payroll offices

Lend-lease

page 98 -UNRRA will have charge of feeding allies, not Department

158 -Percentages of food for lend-lease for 1942-3

756-8 -Figures for food allocations to lend-lease

1168 -Lend-lease allocations to Office of Distribution 1943 (table)

Livestock

page 789-Jones mentions possible disagreement between Department and OPA but refuses to answer further regarding policy of OPA in livestock prices

823-WFA says we should slaughter cattle now

r. Dunn

page 12-20 -Why it is so hard for Democrats to realize that the Republican Members should be polled

30 -Comparing Herman Lautenbach and Joe

40 -Issue earlier year after year which are not authorized by law

44-46 -Office set-up of Secretary (as TVA and CCC) and personnel

48-51 -Mr. Slattery's activity and work in TVA

72a -Mr. Appleby's relations with TVA

74-5 -Situation with dual Deputy Administrators of TVA

r. Lorce

page 79-80 -Value of farm workload accounting evaluations work

abor

page 1 -TVA has responsibility for forcing farm labor

14 -Are people aware of what agriculture could do with more labor

24-6 -Jones reports on imported labor

26 -Jones proposes to use United States to forcing labor

33-7 -Supplies only for eligibility certificated labor's wages

37 -Local farmers' conditions which are wage rates

39 -Table showing numbers of farmers, etc. receiving AAA and by

r. Lambertson

page 61 -Vice President is responsible for TVA -- Secretary cannot have last word over TVA

62 -Objects to federal control of forests

63-7 -Against restricting water TVA. TVA can

68-9 -Questions TVA's negligence in closing unused banks

69 -Government money depositing private banks in the [illegible]

69 -Talks TVA without use

71 -Wilson's power transmit to TVA, etc. etc. Problem, also Slattery's record

72 -Argues "advisory to president" without audit

72a -Mr. Appleby's relations with TVA

74 -Says the farmers feel the Department is not helping them

75-7 -Commercialization of most inspection payroll officers

and-lease

page 92 -TVAA will have charge of Tenant utilize, not Department

93 -Percentages of land for land-lease for [illegible]

95-8 -Figures for land allocations in land-lease

102 -Land-lease allocations to Office of Distribution [illegible]

ineyard

page 113-Jones mentions possible disagreement between Department and TVA but refuses to speak further regarding policy of TVA in live-stock prices

127-TVA says we should slaughter entire row

Loans
page 612-3-Lamberton against FCA now (FCA)
616 -Condition of loans made by FCA
618-9-Questions FCA's neglect of closing unused banks
622 -Says Government money is crowding little banks out
975 -Policy of Congress on purchase price on farm tenant loans
978 -Table giving Farm tenancy loans by states
979 -Price limitation on loans in excess of $12000
991 -Government funds are not used for leasing land
994 -Eligibility requirements for loans in FSA exclude those who have been on for 5 years and have not repaid 50%
995 -Responsibility for FSA loans' administration

Machinery
See Farm Machinery

Mr. Maycock
page 60-Defines "federal employees" in Extension work, etc.

Meat
See Livestock

Meat inspection
page 1162-7-Decentralization of meat inspection payroll offices

Mr. Millard
page 817-Availability of farm machinery

National Forests
page 564-Lamberton objects to federal control

Mr. Neal
page 684-7-Questions Slattery's authority and work
740-3-Wickard explains his directive giving coordinating powers to Neal

Negroes
page 118-24-Discussion of negroes on Department payrolls and pressures

Mr. Nicholson
page 684-7-Describes Slattery's work as chief of RSA
722-30-Gives his opinion concerning insurance plan for RSA
731-2-Explains set-up with dual Deputy Administrators in RSA

Office of Distribution
page 842-3 -Functions of O.of D.
1120 -Agricultural commodities' distribution to state welfare agencies
1139ff-Questions legal right to collect tax from handlers of dairy products
1154ff-Legal right to collect tax from handlers of dairy products
1168 -Lend-lease allocations to FSA for 1943 (table)
1471- -Farm Bureau's recommendations for O. of D.

Office of Economic Stabilization
page 23 -Sheppard states OES's "manipulations" in relation to Department of Agriculture
91 -Department is being humiliated by OES setups.
838-OES delegates power to WFA for approving salary increases

Office of Land Use Coordination
page 109-16-Office setup described

Office of Price Administration
page 5 -Responsibility for prices of dairy products
23-6 -Responsibility for prices of mixed feed
91 -President set-up OPA; the Secretary cannot go above his wishes
716 -Wickard's powers reassigned to OPA, etc.
725 -Cooperation with WFA
789 -Jones does not answer regarding policy of another agency (OPA)
See also prices

Col. Olmstead
page 842-3 -Describes functions of O. of D. and assignments of allocations
1120 -Describes distribution of agricultural commodities to State welfare agencies
1162-7-Decentralization of meat inspection payroll offices
1168 -Lend-lease allocations to FDA for 1943 (table)

Mr. O'Neal
page 1466-86-Farm Bureau's interest and suggestions in agencies of the Department

Parity
page 13-Table of parity and comparable prices for farm products
93-Secretary Wickard defines parity and discusses base period
94-5-Farmer will do well if parity is fair and he is getting parity or better on everything now
157-Tolley gives his views on base periods

Personnel
page 105 -Deferments to employees in percentages and types of jobs
109-16 -Office organization of Secretary, WFA and OLUC
118-24 -Negro employees of the Department
127-30 -Need of 2 lawyers, etc. on guayule project
163 -Tolley discusses field and Department workers
838 -Table showing numbers of farmers, wage workers, managers and foremen receiving $2500 or more

Mr. Plumley
page 97 -Says WFA can countermand Secretary's orders
149-54 -Says dairying isn't profitable in Southeastern U.S.A.
163 -Resents subsidy
183 -Statistics on jars doesn't signify canned food available
570 -Favors continuing guayule experiments
684-7 -Questions Slattery's work as chief of RFC
719 -Questions RFC trips to Mexico
720 -Mr. Appleby's relations with R&A
737 -Questions Craig's reason for resigning from RFC
791 -Thinks FDA should have charge of fish for food
1255 -Thinks CSC has more power than Congress meant for it

Clayton

page 217-Independent equipment FCA can [illegible]
[illegible] -Insertion of [illegible] and [illegible] FCA
[illegible]-Describe FCC's requiem of [illegible] working hours
[illegible] -Give overnment money in [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -Point of [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -Price [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible]
[illegible] -Government funds are not used for [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -Eligibility requirements for [illegible] in FCC employs those who have
been on [illegible] for 5 years and have not reached [illegible]'s
[illegible] -Re-eligibility for [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]ellaway

See [illegible] Hartshorn

Mr. Morrow

page [illegible]-[illegible] "Federal [illegible]" in [illegible] [illegible], etc.

[illegible]

See Livestock

[illegible] Inspection

page [illegible]-Interpretation of [illegible] inspection [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. Willard

page [illegible]-[illegible]ability of [illegible] [illegible]

National [illegible]

page [illegible]-Inspection [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

page [illegible]-[illegible] [illegible]'s [illegible] and [illegible]
[illegible]-Stamped [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

page [illegible]-Dismissal of [illegible] on [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]

page [illegible]-[illegible] [illegible]'s [illegible] on [illegible] of [illegible]
[illegible]-To [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]

page [illegible]-[illegible] of [illegible] [illegible].
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible]' [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] for [illegible] (table)
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible]'s [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]

page [illegible] -[illegible] [illegible]'s "[illegible]" [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Office of Land Use Coordination
page 109-16-Office setup described

Office of Price Administration
page 5 -Responsibility for prices of dairy products
73-6 -Responsibility for prices of mixed feed
91 -President set-up OPA; the Secretary cannot go above his wishes
716 -Wickard's powers reassigned to OPA, etc.
785 -Cooperation with WFA
789 -Jones does not answer regarding policy of another agency (OPA)
See also prices

Col. Olmstead
page 842-3 -Describes functions of O. of D. and assignments of allocations
1120 -Describes distribution of agricultural commodities to State welfare agencies
1162-7-Decentralization of meat inspection payroll offices
1168 -Lend-lease allocations to FDA for 1943 (table)

Mr. O'Neal
page 1466-86-Farm Bureau's interest and suggestions in agencies of the Department

Parity
page 13-Table of parity and comparable prices for farm products
93-Secretary Wickard defines parity and discusses base period
94-5-Farmer will do well if parity is fair and he is getting parity or better on everything now
157-Tolley gives his views on base periods

Personnel
page 105 -Deferments to employees in percentages and types of jobs
109-16 -Office organization of Secretary, WFA and OLUC
118-24 -Negro employees of the Department
127-30 -Need of 2 lawyers, etc. on guayule project
163 -Tolley discusses field and Department workers
838 -Table showing numbers of farmers, wage workers, managers and foremen receiving $2500 or more

Mr. Plumley
page 97 -Says WFA can countermand Secretary's orders
149-54 -Says dairying isn't profitable in Southeastern USA
163 -Resents subsidy
183 -Statistics on jars doesn't signify canned food available
570 -Favors continuing guayule experiments
684-7 -Questions Slattery's work as chief of REA
719 -Questions REA trips to Mexico
720 -Mr. Appleby's relations with REA
737 -Questions Craig's reason for resigning from REA
791 -Thinks FDA should have charge of fish for food
1255 -Thinks CCC has more power than Congress meant for it

Office of Land Use Coordination

page 109-10-Office being described

Office of Price Administration

page 3 -Responsibility for prices of dairy products
3-5 -Responsibility for prices of wheat farm
91 -Problems working with the secretary [illegible] to share its claims
91G -Without a power comparable to OPA, etc.
79G -Cooperation with OPA
79H -Farms does not agree regarding price of milk [illegible]
See also prices

Off. Continued

page 340-3 -Describes functions of O. of C. and establishment of allocations
112G -Describes distribution of national farm committee to state
welfare agencies
112H-J-establishment of meat inspection [illegible] offices
112K -Land-lease allocations in OPA for 1943 (table)

Off. Final

page 156-65-Ickes Darrow's history and [illegible] in operation of the
department

Ohio

page 17-Data of policy and economic prices for farm products
17-Secretary closed during [illegible] and discussion [illegible]
24-Farmer will do well if price is high and he is getting [illegible]
or better on everything [illegible]
177-Valley cities are [illegible] on farm prices

Oregon

page 105 -Difference in [illegible] in [illegible] and type of job
107-10 -Office organization of [illegible], 70 and 71
114-20 -Large [illegible] of [illegible]
127-30 -Lack of [illegible], etc. or [illegible] problem
167 -Valley [illegible] fish and [illegible] [illegible]
172 -Table showing [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] workers, [illegible] and
[illegible] [illegible] 50 or more

Off. Final

page 97 -Page 101 [illegible] Secretary's [illegible]
101-2 -Page [illegible] Land's [illegible] in [illegible]
183 -[illegible] [illegible]
185 -[illegible] as [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]-7 -[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible]
[illegible] -Mr. [illegible]'s [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible]'s [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] for [illegible]
[illegible] -[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Post-war
page 1 -Activities of the Department
98 -UNRRA will be responsible for feeding allies
1471,1473-Farm Bureau recommends plans to Department regarding surpluses

Poultry
See Dairy and poultry

Prices
page 5 -OPA responsibility for checking Dairy prices
13 -Comparable prices for farm products (table)
15 -Neglect of Departmental responsibility to cotton farmer to see he gets fair price
23-6 -OPA responsibility for checking prices on mixed feed
92 -Secretary says farmer not opposed to roll-back
612 -Financial conditions of agriculture very good
756-8-Jones gives Department's price support program
779 -President's veto giving prices which would be caused by passage of subsidy and roll back bill
789 -Jones mentions possible disagreement between Department and OPA but will not discuss further regarding OPA price policy for livestock
975 -Congress' policy regarding purchase price on Farm tenant loans
1120 -Government price support obligations being met by distribution of agricultural commodities to State welfare agencies

Production Credit Association
page 612-3-Against continuing PCA under FCA-Lambertson
632 -Against PCA at this time

Profit
page 15 -Department has neglected cotton farmer, who can't make a profit
612-Agriculture has improved financially in past years

Publications
See Farmer's Bulletin

Publicity
132-Radio networks contribute time to give food conservation announcements

Rationing
1191ff-Method of milk distribution in lieu of rationing

Mr. Reid
page 63 -Decrease in Department's employees between June-December 1943
105 -Gives numbers of employees who have been deferred and their jobs
118 -Answers questions regarding negro employees of Department
118-24 -Fair Employment Practices Committee has not sought to intervene

Relations
See Authority

Responsibility
See Authority

Finance

page 2 -Activities of the department
96 -Who will be responsible for funding prices
14/1,17/1-Does farmer economic plans be department regarding surpluses

Foodler

See Dairy and poultry

Fruits

page 5 -Who responsibility for marketing dairy plans
13 -Compensation prices for fruit products (table)
15 -Effect of Government involvement in notion farmer to use
the pale fruit price
15-6 -Who responsibility for absorbing prices on plant fees
20 -Farmerry says farmer not allowed to sell-Dell
61/ -Financial conditions of orchardists very poor
75/8-Jones gives Government's price support options
77/ -President's pale giving prices which would be scared by passage
of subsidy and sell back bill
79 -Jones mentions possible disagreement between Department and CFA
but will not discuss further regarding CFA price policy for
livestock
97/ -Dairyman' milky regarding producer price on raw fruit loans
110 -Government price support activities being put by distributors of
agricultural commodities in their milkin economics

Fundamentals Credit Association

page 4/2-Farmer questioning the money for-Conservation
63/ -Lagular PCA as this time

Fruits

page 13 -Government has implicated cotton farmer, who can's make a profit
die-Agriculture has improved financially in past years

Publications

See Tammy's Bulletin

Publicity

13/-Radio network consistute time to give food conservation announcements

Quotation

11/12-Method of milk distribution in lieu of rationing

Mr. Bain

page 63 -Increase in Department's employees between Jose-Deseline 1961
106 -Given numbers of employees and have been deferred and their jobs
112 -Answers questions regarding major employers of Department
112-24 -Fair Employment practices committee has not caught in interviews

Relations

See industry

Responsibility

See industry

Mr. Roosevelt
page 91 -Responsible for CFA and therefore controls it
716-8 -Lamberton says President OKed Slattery's removal from RSA
779 -Veto message containing increases in prices if subsidy bill passes

Rural Electrification Administration
page 684-7 -Questions Slattery's authority and work
704-5 -Slattery says he wasn't notified of hearings and is ignorant of budget
706-7 -Slattery says Wickard took his powers away without right
710ff -Slattery explains events leading to the fight
715 -Slattery tells how he's well earned his salary
716 -Lamberton says since the President controls Wickard, the President OKed Wickard's removal of Slattery
717 -Slattery tells of his activities since his powers were taken away
719 -Plumley questions RSA trips to Mexico
720 -Discussion of Mr. Appleby's relations with RSA
721-2 -Mr. Slattery describes proposed insurance plans
722-30-Nicholson describes proposed insurance plans
731-2 -Nicholson explains the seeming dual Deputy Administrator
737 -Plumley questions Craig's reason for resigning
740-3 -Wickard explains his directive giving "coordinating powers"
744-8 -Slattery's letter to Wickard
749-51-Hamilton describes the situation
864 -Slattery's letter to Tarver

Rubber
See Guayule

Mr. Salisbury
page 132 -Radio contributes time to make conservation and food announcements
135-8-Discusses Reprinting of 1942 Agriculture Yearbook

School lunch
page 1134-Smith discusses program
1157- Wene and Smith discuss program and surpluses to institutions

Mr. Sheppard
page 23 -Says WFA takes what it wants from the Department
684-7 -Questions Slattery's work in RSA
862 -Questions legality of Facilities Security activities
1161 -Losses from spoilage at storage places

Mr. Shields
page 127-30-Justifies 2 lawyers for work in Guayule project
1201 -Tells of milk industry's agreement to distribution plan in lieu of rationing
1255 -Powers of CCC

Mr. Roosevelt

page 91 -Responsible for the GAC Emergency measures is
715-6 -Democratic keys President Cabot Lodge's renewal from GAA
717 -Pres message constituting Democrats in Congress if nominating will cause

Guest Identifications Interpretation

page 694-7 -American Battery's authority and work
704-5 -Battery must be voted's refusing of Congress and is Congress of budget
706-7 -Battery says Federal food is, parts away without right
706-8 -Battery explains events leading to the fight
715 -Battery tells Sen Ia's well answer his entry
716 -Lodge-Cross says since the President controls Congress, the President Cabot Lodge's control of Congress
717 -Battery tells of his activities since his power was taken away
719 -Battery questions GOP tel-r to Lodge
720 -Discussion of Mr. Appleby's relations with GOP
721-4 -Mr. Battery describes proposed Isolationist plans
722-20-Isolation describes proposed Isolationist plans
723-2 -Isolation explains the meaning that Lodge defeatists
727 -Battery questions Lodge's reason for resigning
730-2 -Lodge explains his directive giving "moral backing power"
731-4 -Battery's letter to Lodge
734-5 -Isolation instructions for mitigation
735 -Battery's letter to Taney

Cabinet

See Sequels

Mr. Battery

page 172 -Lodge contributes time to some committees and text accomplishments
173-3-Discusses Importance of 1920 Isolationists Teachers

Colonel Jones

page 112-Bell discusses program
113-7- Ness and Bell discuss reasons and surrounds to Isolationists

Mr. Garrard

page 23 -Says Wa takes what it wants from the Democrats
624-7 -Questions Battery's work in GC
626 -Questions legality of Isolation Leagues activities
1151 -Leaves from meeting at Lodge place

Mr. Bailey

page 127-10-Identifies 2 lawyers for work in Lodge project
1301 -Tells of this Industry's agreement in the elimination of Ian of workers
1305 -Powers of GOP

Mr. Slattery

page 704-5-Not notified of hearings and knows nothing of budget
706-7-Secretary Wickard had no authority to oust him
710ff-Explains events leading to the fight
715,717,719-Explains his duties since being ousted
720 -Mr. Appleby's relations with REA
721-2-Describes ~~his~~ the proposed insurance plans for REA
744-8-His letter to the Secretary
864 -His letter to Mr. Tarver

Mr. Smith

page 852 -Describes civilian requirements and distribution
854 -Tells of food distribution at war plants (in-feeding)
1134-Discusses school lunch program
1157-School lunch program and surpluses to institutions

Soil conservation

See ACP and SCS

Soil Conservation Service

page 63 -Decrease in employees between June and December 1943
1474-Farm Bureau's recommendations on soil conservation

Stamp plan

page 1120-It's been ~~suspended~~ superseded by distribution of agricultural commodities to State welfare agencies ~~take its place~~

Storage

page 183 -Spoilage and hoarding of empty jars makes statistics of canned food inaccurate when counting jars sold
1161 -Losses from spoilage at storage places
1235 -Table showing WFA storage stocks
1261-2 -Table of canned goods in warehouse

Subsidy

page 92 -Wickard says farms as a whole do not oppose subsidy
1156-Talley gives views on subsidy
163-Plumley resents subsidy
778-Jones will not comment on authority for RFC subsidies
779-President's veto to subsidy bill containing prices which would occur
954-AAA conservation program not involved in subsidy fight

Tables

page 8 -Table of farmers'wages and prices paid to factory workers
13 -Table of parity and comparable prices for farm products
839 -Table of numbers of farmers, wage workers, managers and foremen getting $2500 or more
978 -Table of Farm tenancy loans by states
1235 -Table of WFA storage stocks on February 1, 1944
1261-2 -Table of canned goods in warehouse

[illegible]. Conservation

page 104 -Text notified of meeting and cause notices of hearing
105-107-Secretary Wickard has no authority to vest him
108-112-Kyleine wants hearing in the Tetons
113,114,115-Kopiahs bid on the sites being sought
116 -Mr. Kopiahs's relations with Ickes
117-118-Describes [illegible] proposed insurance plans for CCC
119-120-Is letter to the Secretary
121 -His letter to Mr. Tarver

[illegible]. Health

page 122 -Describes sterilization requirements and distribution
123 -Tells of idea distributing of war plants (in-reading)
124-Discusses school lunch program
127-School lunch program and compliance to instructions

[illegible]il Conservation

See 126 and 128

[illegible]il Conservation Service

page 129 -Controlled in employees between June and December 1941
130-Farm Bureau's recommendations on soil conservation

[illegible]ance Plan

page 132-Ickes's own [illegible] by elimination of agricultural commodities
to their military equivalent [illegible]

[illegible]rage

page 133 -Hoarding and bunching of fruit jars causes scarcity of second
[illegible] inaccurate when counting jars sold
134 -Losses from spoilage at storage plants
135 -Tells stating 1/3 storage stocks
136-137-Tells of second grade in warehouse

[illegible]ghts

page 32 -Tenant says farm as a whole is not poorer subject
138-Tells gives views on society
139-Tenant presents society
140-Jones will not comment on authority for 21 subsidies
141-President's wife to visit Hill, contributing prices with which cause
142-Are conservation programs and tenants in society fight

[illegible]ldiers

page 8 -Table of farmers'wages and prices paid to factory workers
11 -Table of quality and conservable prices for farm products
49 -Table of members of Congress, war veteran, mourners and farmers
getting [illegible] or more
93 -Table of farm tenancy loans by states
129 -Table of 1934 storage stocks on February 1, 1938
136-137-Table of second grade in warehouse

Mr. Tarver
page 5 -Department is not helping dairy farmer of Southeast
15 -Department is not helping cotton farmer get fair prices
18-20 -Department is not following Congress' wish to reprint 1942 Yearbook
30 -Surprised that Department budget estimate is reduced
34 -Department is playing second fiddle to WFA
69 -Many items carried from year to year without authorization by law
109-16-Office set up of Secretary and WFA and CLUC and personnel
118-24-Questions concerning negro employees of Department
127-30-Questions expenditures for guayule program
133 -Farmer's Bulletin should be distributed more generously to farm states
135-8 -Reprinting of 1942 Yearbook
143 -Department should have more control of fertilizer
149-54-Does not think dairying is profitable in Southeastern USA
163 -Questions economy of men and money in field workers' system
570 -Questions continuation of guayule program
611 -Doesn't expect WFA to recommend extended loans to FCA
684-7 -Questions Slattery's work
720 -Appleby's relations with RFA
731-2 -Duo-Deputy Administrators in BSA
864 -Letter from Slattery
975 -Congress' policy regarding Farm tenant land purchase loans
1139ff-Questions O. of D's legal right to collect tax from dairy handlers
1281 -Questions legality of CCC use of funds

Tenancy
See Farm tenancy

Mr. Tolley
page 142 -Defines BAE's work
143 -Explains responsibility for fertilizer (WPB and WFA)
149-54-Says dairying is profitable
156 -His views on subsidy and roll-back
157 -His views regarding base period
158 -Percentages of food for civilians, lend-lease, etc. 1942-3
163 -His views on field and Department workers

Unions
page 118-24-CIO and Federal Employees Union pressures regarding negro employment in Department

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration
page 98-Responsibilities for supplying food to allies, etc.

Wages
page 8 -Farmers' wages and prices paid and factory workers' wages
94-5 -Farmers' incomes highest in all time
828-9 -Reasons for set-up for stabilizing farm labor wages
835 -Local farmers' committees for setting wage rates
839 -Table giving salaries over $2500 in numbers (farmers, wage workers, managers, and foremen)
1471 -Farm Bureau recommendations regarding farm wages

Mr. Turner

page 1 -Department is not helping dairy farmers of Portland
1 -Department is not helping dairy farmers get fair prices
1-20 -Department is not following Legislature' plan to repeal 1942 Tax
20 -Surprised that Legislature budget activity is reduced
21 -Department is having second claim on 1?
2 -Dairy items-serial fees prior to year without contribution by law
10-12 -Critics are up at Legislature and Mr. and OLCC and personnel
12-25 -Legislature discussing entire employment of Department
127-30 -Questions expenditures for general purpose
131 -Turner's bulletin should be distributed more generously in these states
133-4 -Regulation of OPS Hearings
143 -Department should have more control of travelling
144-48 -Does not think dairying is profitable in Southwestern and
149 -Questions economy if men not work in field reviews' areas
150 -Turner gives continuation of dairy program
151 -Turner's request 12% in resources expended loans to FCA
154-7 -Questions Blanton's work
170 -Kuykendall's relations with BAE
171-2 -Has Department helped farmers in 42?
174 -Letter from Stanley
177 -Farmers' policy regarding Farm Bureau land purchase leases
177-12 -Questions O. of A's legal right to collect the farm dairy handlers
181 -Questions legality of BAE use of funds

Turner

See Turn summary

Mr. Miller

page 183 -Defines BAE's work
187 -Explains responsibility for Dairy (farm and BAE)
190-2 -Says dairying is profitable
192 -He views on subsidy and roll-back
197 -His views regarding base period
198 -Percentage of Pool for distribution, Land-Lease, etc. 197-7
201 -His view on Field and Department writers

Stone

page 114-20 -CCC and Federal Employees Union resources regarding secure employees in Department

Grant Burton Baker and Independent Producers

page 2-Responsibilities for supplying food to cities, etc.

Cone

page 4 -Farmers' wages not higher than and factory workers' wages
9-10 -Farmers' income higher in all time
20-9 -Farmers for ever-up for abolishing farm labor wages
23 -Local Farmers' committees for setting wage rate
27 -Farm labor salaries over 1500 in numbers (farmers, wage workers, managers, and farmers)
147 -Farm Bureau recommendations regarding farm wages

War Food Administration

page 2 -Cooperation with Department; authority of WFA
3 -Responsibility ~~of~~ for farm machinery and equipment
4 -Responsibility for foreign farm labor
5 -Responsibility for dairy farmer in Southeast
23-6 -Responsibility for checking differential on mixed feed
34,91 -Charges WFA has usurped Department's functions
97 -Charges WFA can countermand Secretary's orders
109-16 -Discussion of WFA office set-up
143 -Knows answer to lag in manufacture and distribution of farm machinery
611 -Tarver doesn't expect WFA to recommend extended loans to FCA (RACC)
716 -Department's powers have been removed to WFA charged
756-8 -Jones' report and explanation concerning food allocations
759 -Authority of WFA concerning farm machinery
764 -Jones prefers to use United States to foreign labor
778 -Jones will not comment on where the RFC subsidies should be
785 -Cooperation with OPA
789 -Jones will not comment on OPA policy
791 -Plumley thinks WFA should control fish for food
823 -WFA says we should slaughter cattle now
838 -Power delegated by OES for increasing salaries of agricultural workers
1191ff -Jones explains plan put into use in lieu of milk rationing
1235 -Table showing WFA storage stocks on February 1, 1944

War Production Board

page 143-WPB knows cause of lag in farm machinery manufacture and distribution
759-Authority of WPB regarding farm machinery

Mr. Watts

page 564-Says Federal Control of forests is not new and is necessary

Mr. Wells

page 23-Denies that WFA takes what they want from the Department

Mr. Wene

page 23-6 -Says Department has not backed the egg program they started
149-54-Says Dairying is not profitable in Southeastern USA
1154ff-Questions O. of E's legal right to collect tax from dairy handlers
1157 -School lunch program and surpluses to institutions

Mr. Wickard

p.2 Post-war plans of Department

page 2 -Describes cooperation with WFA; authority of Secretary and WFA
3 -WFA has charge of farm machinery
4 -WFA has charge of foreign farm labor
5 -WFA has charge of dairy situation, and OPA of prices
23-6 -WFA has charge of checking differentials of mixed feed and OPA prices
90 -Department has cut activities and personnel to fit war schedules
92 -Farmers as a whole do not oppose subsidy
93 -Defines "parity"; discusses base period
94-5 -Farm income has increased

(Continued on page 15)

Mr. Fred Schlichting

Page 1 —Consultation with Department authorities of the
2 —Responsibility of farm workers and employees
3 —Responsibility for foreign farm labor
3 —Responsibility for entry forms to Canada
3-5 —Responsibility for obtaining information on alien land
6,7 —Charges DPA are usurped Department's functions
7 —Charges DPA are overzealous Secretary's orders
10-15 —Discussion of DPA policies set-up
16-17 —Farmer reason to fear his transportation and electrification of farm machinery
18 —Farmer knows's support DPA to recommend extended leave to DPA (Lucc
19 —Department's efforts have been reserved to DPA alarmed
20-22 —Farmers' report and explanation concerning land alienations
23 —Authority of DPA prevented farm mechanic
24 —Farmer workers in San Fernando Valley or Foreign Labor
25 —Farmer will not support or share the DPA authority should be
26 —Consultation with DPA
27 —Farmer will not consent to DPA policy
28 —Farmer claims DPA annual security plan for farm
29 —DPA says no should alienation policy now
30 —Farmer delegated by DPA for interviewing laborers of undesirable workers
31-32 —Farmer explicit plan for land use in view of DPA policies
33-35 —Table showing DPA stations alien to Category I, type

Mr. Produce Shaw

Page 36-37 Farmer owner of land in Fire evacuation evacuators and distribution
38 —Authority of DPA supervising farm machinery

Mr. Tatle

Page 39 —Says Federal Control of farmers is not enough and is inadequate

Mr. Jolly

Page 40 —Denies that DPA takes what they want from the Department

Mr. Ross

Page 41-3 —Says Department has not taken the rent prices they charged
44 —Says laborer is not partially in contradiction with
45-47 —Questions G. of DPA legal right to collect the free entry permits
48-51 —Gives legal reasons and conclusions to Institutions

Mr. Stamos

Page 1 —Describes plans of Department
2 —Describes cooperation with DPA; authority of inspectors and all
3 —DPA has charge of farm machinery
4 —DPA has charge of Spanish farm labor
5 —DPA has charge of Japan alienation and farmer policy
6-8 —DPA has charge of directing difficulties of minor land and DPA, prior
9 —Department has one authorities and responsibility in its two schedules
10 —Farmers as a whole is not opposed authority
11 —Describes "Jolly's" difficulties have started
12-13 —Says farmer has tactfulness
(continued on page 15)

(Continued from page 14)

97 -Plumley says WFA can countermand Secretary's orders. Secretary says vice versa but there is cooperation

98 -UNRRA will be responsible for feeding allies, not Department

109-16-Office set-up

706-7 -Slattery says Secretary had no authority to oust him

716 -Lamberton says Wickard's powers were clipped, so Secretary OKed Slattery's removal

740-3 -Explains his directive giving "coordinating powers" to Neal

744-8 -Slattery's letter to Wickard

Mr. Wingate

page 1489-92-Talks on AAA

Woodland

See Farm woodland

See also National Forests

Yearbook

See Agricultural Yearbook

N.B. See also indexes in back of Agriculture Department Appropriation Hearings as follows:

page 1525-Index of projects covered by items in agricultural appropriation bill

1601-List of witnesses

1604-General index

(Continued from page 3)

97 -Finally, state the non-convergence condition's values, especially when value never has ships in convergence

98 -Model will be responsible for drawing offset, and engineer

100-10-Stress analy

105-7 -Similar note concerning had an activity to read its

106 -Hydrostatics note finding's power and lights, so checking

(See Jeffrey's answer)

106-3 -Explains his discussion getting "controlling energy" to load

106-8 -Jeffrey's letter to Jeanne

Tr. Jiang

page 1429-32-Jiang on job

Football

See Pete Goodland

See also National Forests

Tenfoot

See Agricultural Tarzans

3.3. The Jobs Industry in Book of Instructions Department Supervision Jennings on Jeffrey:

page 1525-Index of project design by lines in mechanical engineering-Jeffrey Bill

1601-List of objectives

1604-Journal Index

A P P E N D I X

C O N T E N T S

—oooOooo—

AMENDMENTS

Committee A-1
Member A-3
Senate amendments in disagreement A-4

EXCERPTS A-6

LETTERS A-7

MEMORANDA A-7

MISCELLANEOUS A-8

STATEMENTS..... A-8

TABLES A-8

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS - See Print 3

Page	Line	Subject	Page
4	18	Office of the Solicitor - increase in funds	4658
5	1	Office of the Solicitor - increase in funds	4658
7	21	Office of Information - change in designation of act	4658
10	22	BAE - personnel in D. C.	4658
11	14	BAE - economic investigations	4658
21	16	BAI - deleting comma	4658
22	3	BAI - eradication of tuberculosis and Bang's disease	4658
23	15	BAI - hog cholera control	4658
24	2	BAI - inspection and quarantine	4658
24	7	BAI - meat inspection	4658
24	14	BAI - Virus Serum Toxin Act	4658
24	16	BAI - marketing agreements with respect to: hog cholera, virus and serum	4658
27	11	BPI - building construction	4658
28	19	BPI - Agricultural engineering investigation.	4658
29	6	BPI - crop and cereal disease investigation..	4658
29	19	BPI - dry-land agriculture investigation	4659
30	18	BPI - fruit and vegetable crop disease investigation	4659
31	19	BPI - plant exploration, etc.	4659
32	15	BPI - soil survey investigation	4659
32	25	BPI - tobacco investigation	4659
35	2	BE&PQ - citrus canker eradication	4659
38	1	BE&PQ - barberry eradication	4659
39	13	BE&PQ - foreign parasites	4659
42	6	BAIC - building construction and alteration ..	4659
44	13-14	BEltsville Research Center-building construction	4659
46	6	FS - personal services in D.C.	4659
53	6	FS - forest management	4659
53	10	FS - range investigation	4659;4683
53	13	FS - forest products	4659
53	17	FS - forest economics investigation	4659
54	11	FS - forest fire cooperation and control	4659
54	16-19	FS - forest fire cooperation and control	4659
58	4-8	Emergency Rubber project - liquidation	4660
59	16	WFA - automobile purchases	4660
60	4	WFA - wage stabilization	4660
60	14	CCC - administrative expenses	4661
61	21	CCC - parity prices for cotton	4661
62	5	CCC - perishable commodities	4661

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS - See Print 3, cont'd

Page	Line	Subject	Page
63	5	~~Book purchases, etc.~~	4661
63	11 - 16	incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes ,.....	4661
64	1	transfer of funds to AAA	4661
64	18	deleting word	4661
64	24	AAA payments	4661
65	21	making funds for farming practices available through 1946	4661
66	11	political activity	4661-75
66	11	WFA - payments on irish potatoe and commercial truck crops; offered by Overton as a committee amendment	4684
66	24	political activity	4663-75
67	19	Federal crop insurance - liquidation	4678
69	16	SCS - State agency approval on agreements	4678
71	15	school lunch	4678
73	11	marketing service	4678
73	15	loans, grants and rural rehabilitation	4678-79
73	23	loans, grants and rural rehabilitation - liquidation of RR projects	4679
79	16	work requirements for recipients of grants	4679
83	4	Farm tenancy - salaries and expenses	4679
83	8	Farm tenancy - loans	4679
84	9	Farm tenancy - water facilities, etc.	4679
85	14	REA - funds from RFC	4680
85	8	REA - salary and expenses	4679

MEMBER AMENDMENTS

Author	Page	Line	Print	Subject	Offered	Agreed to	Rejected
Anderson	59	9-10-11	1	farm wage stabilization	3033	-	3034
Boren	78	5	1	to prohibit REA from financing generating plants in places with population in excess of 1500,etc.	3080	-	3083
Cannon	67	23	1	approval of State agencies on SCS agreements	3075	3076	-
Chavez	56	19	3	FS - post-war planning for forestry	4681	ruled out on point of order	-4683
Cochran	64	25	1	political activity	3068	-	3069
Danaher	66	11	3	political activity - amendment to Com.amendment ..	4663	-	4675
Danaher	66	17	3	modification of amendment - deleting "making or"..	4669	4669	-
Danaher	66	15	3	modification of amendment - deleting "full-time", and inserting "since June 1, 1944"	4669	4669	-
Dirksen	(22	10	1)	relate to same subject matter and in the aggregate provide an increase of $996,000 in different items under animal husbandry, the money to be used for reclassification of veterinarians	-3022-	(debated) (3023-29)	3029
	(23	22	1)				
	(24	8	1)				
	(24	13	1)				
	(24	20	1)				
	(24	22	1)				
Guerney	.....			Federal Seed Act -subsec.(b)(2) of Sec. 203	4380	-	-
Harness	65	18	1	prohibiting demands that persons join AAA in order to get deferments, gasoline, etc.	3035	(3041-Com.) (3084-House)	Correction-3067
Murdock	53	10	3	amendment to Committee amendment re: range investigation funds	4683	4684	-
Overton	66	11	3	offered as committee amendment - WFA - payments on irish potatoe and commercial truck crops	4684	4684	-
Rees	(62	5	2	to limit individual AAA payments to $500	3069	-	3075
	(10	23	3	BAE - salary of Dr. Tolley	4680	4680	-
	(16	11	3	ARA - salary of Administrator	4680	4680	-
Russell ..	(49	12	3	FS - salary of Chief Forester	4680	4680	-
	(59	12	3	WFA - travel expenses	4680	4680	-
	(63	6	3	use of "Sec. 32 funds"	4681	4681	-
Taber	43	24	1	BHN&HE - reduction in funds	3029	-	3030
Tarver ...	(79	22	4	Amendment to Senate Amendment 65 - FSA	6384	6389	-
	(54	25	4	Amendment to Senate Amendment 40 - forest fire ...	6306	6306	-

SENATE AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT - See Print 4

No.	Page	Line	Subject	Debated	Agreed to	Rejected
5	10	23	BAE - salary of chief	6009	6010	-
7	16	17	ARA - salary of administrator	6009	6010	-
9	22	10)				
10	23	22)				
11	24	8)...	BAI - salary increases for veteri-	6010-12)	6302	-
12	24	14)	narians	6300-02)		
13	24	21)				
14	24	23)				
17	29	2	BPI - building construction at Houma, Louisiana		6302	-
25	38	10	BE&RQ - barberry eradication	6302-05	6305	-
27	42	15	BA&IC - cost of buildings	(6306 - House agreed to with amendment (6389 - House requests further conference (6357 - Senate agreed to House amendment		
31	49	20	FS - salary of Chief Forester	6009	6010	-
40	54	25	FS forest-fire cooperation	(6306 - House agreed to with amendment (6389 - House requests further conference (6357 - Senate agreed to House amendment		
41	58	10	Emergency rubber project	6363-69	6370	-
43	59	18	WFA - travel expense	-	6306	-
48	62	10	CCC - determining parity price of middling cotton	-	6306	-
52	64	5	incentive payments	-	6306	-
53	64	9	incentive payments	(6306 - House agreed to with amendment (6389 - House requests further conference (6357 - Senate agreed to House amendment		

SENATE AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT - See Print 4, continued

No.	Page	Line	Subject	Debated	Agreed to	Rejected
59	67	5	WFA - payments on irish potatoes and commercial truck crops ..	-	6306	-
60	67	18	political activity	(6370-72 (6379-83 (6561-62 (6624	6562) 6625)	compromise language agreed to
63	72	22	school milk and lunch program	6307	6307	-with an amendment
65	79	22	FSA	(6308 (6383 (6389 ((6389 ((6357- (	- House action postponed - House agrees to with amendment - House requests further conference Senate agreed to House amendment	
66	84	11	Farm tenancy	-	6389	-
71	86	22	REA funds from RFC	-	6389	-

EXCERPTS

Churchill, Prime Minister Winston - Protest to Parliament re: appearing before that body .. 3015

Eisenhower, Maj. Dwight D. - Report on production of guayule in New Mexico, California and Texas ..... (3013 (6369

House Report No. 1430 - Activities of FSA 6386

White, Mastin G., Solicitor - Opinion of Jan. 6, 1941, re: applicability of Hatch Act 6371

Willkes, Maj. Gilbert Van B. - Report on production of guayule in New Mexico, California and Texas 3013

MISCELLANEOUS

From	to	date	subject	page
Affidavit from Polk County, Nebr. farmers	-	-	AAA gasoline rationing policy	4664
House Report No. 1430	-	5-9-44	Activities of FSA	6386
News item in Washington Post	-	3-24-44	Kaiser and Reconversion	3076
Telegram from Hanns Stratmann	Cong. Rolph	3-24-44	FDO 79 control of milk	3078

STATEMENTS

Pertinent facts re: reclassification of BAI employees, signed by several lifestock associations 3026

Hutson's statement re: Potatoe situation 3034

TABLES

Agriculture Appropriation bill, 1945 - Table showing amount carried in the bill for all purposes as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as it was agreed upon in conference 6625

Agricultural Program, 1942 - number of payees receiving payments..... 3071

Cheese, maximum prices, etc. 3020

Estimated cost of developing market service 3078

Forest Service - Summary of estimates for detailed project plans for post-war forest and range conservation program, fiscal year 1945 - Planning cost estimate 4682

Government expenditures for paper 3010

Partial list of the larger payments under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity programs - U.S. 2986

Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs - U. S. 2985

Percentages of professional groups by grades 3026

Record of Federal real estate by states 3011

Rubber project liquidation 3013

SCS employees 3021

SCS expenditures during 1943 3022

LETTERS

from	to	date	subject	page
AAA committeemen (cards	Farmers	-	AAA.policy on draft deferment, etc.	3039
BAE Associate Social Science Analyst	-	-	Information on standards of living	3039
Cong. Murray	Hendrickson,FDA	-	Authority for issuing regulations re: slaughtering of livestock	3040
Cotton, C.A. of Nebr.	Sen. Wherry	)3-14-44))4-1-44) -	AAA policy on gasoline rationing	4664
Dewey, Bradley, Rubber Dir. ..	Cong.Anderson	6-17-44	Guayule situation	6364
Farmer in Grant Co. Ill.	Cong. Harness	-	AAA policy on draft deferment	3037
FSA Official	Dem. Nat'l Chm.	12-17-43	Funds for political campaign	4664
Granger, C.M. (FS)	Cong.Anderson	3-31-44	Guayule	3013
Gasoline Rationing Board (OPA)	Cong.McGregor	3-16-44	Gasoline rationing	3018
Hendrickson (FDA)	Cong. Murray	-	Authority for issuing regulations re: slaughtering of livestock	3040
Meat Inspection Div. employees	Cong. Rowan	) Feb.and) Mar.1944	Reclassification of veterinarians	3027
Nelson, Donald M.	Cong. Fulmer	3-13-44	Allocation of steel for farm machinery	3076
Selective Service Board	Draft-age men in Grant Co.Ill.	-	AAA policy on draft deferment	3036
Thorpe, Carlyle	Cong. Outland	6-13-44	Guayule amendment	6367
-	Sen. Wherry	3-30-44	AAA gasoline rationing	4665

MEMORANDA

Dir. Auto Supply Rationing Division of OPA	Regional Offices	3-5-44	AAA certification of farmers rations	3018
Jas.B.Burns,Nat'l Pres. Amer. Federation of Gov.Employees	-	-	Reclassification of veterinarians	6301
Gen. Counsel of REA	House Approp.Com.	-	Electric service to towns having population of 1500 or more	3082

NOTICE: This bill is given out subject to release when consideration of it has been completed by the Whole Committee. Please check on such action before release in order to be advised of any changes.

[FULL COMMITTEE PRINT]

Union Calendar No.

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R.

[Report No.]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 21, 1944

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1945, namely:

1 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act
5 referred to as the Secretary, and other personal services in
6 the Office of the Secretary in the District of Columbia,
7 and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the
8 purchase of one and the maintenance, repair, and operation
9 of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel
10 expenses, including examination of estimates for appropri-
11 ations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equip-
12 ment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising,
13 communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs
14 and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and ex-
15 penses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the
16 practical and efficient work of the Department, which are
17 authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate,
18 $1,700,000, together with such amounts from other appro-
19 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
20 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such services
21 and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof
22 as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a
23 total of $187,390, shall be transferred to and made a part of
24 this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total
25 amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to contract for stenographic reporting services, and the appropriations made in this Act shall be available for such purposes, and to expend from appropriations available for the purchase of lands not to exceed $1 for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land: *Provided further,* That with the approval of the Secretary, employees of the Department stationed abroad may enter into leases for official quarters, for periods not exceeding one year, and may pay rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the discharge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country where custom or practice requires payment in advance: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or

1 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
2 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
3 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
4 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to dam-
5 age threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to
6 future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided fur-*
7 *ther*, That, except to provide materials required in or incident
8 to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
9 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by
10 this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manu-
11 factured from commodities or materials produced outside of
12 the United States.

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor includ-
15 ing personal services in the District of Columbia and else-
16 where, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodi-
17 cals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries
18 by attorneys in the field service, $1,830,632, together with
19 such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as
20 are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal
21 year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or
22 portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary,
23 not exceeding a total of $340,000, shall be transferred to
24 and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be
25 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia

1 not to exceed $1,075,000: *Provided, however,* That if the
2 total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the
3 fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the
4 amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for
5 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred thereform
6 to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended
7 for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be
8 increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of
9 the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with
10 representatives of the Department, shall determine are ap-
11 propriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions
12 or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

13 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses in connection with the pub-
16 lication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins,
17 documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and
18 display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and
19 exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the
20 Department, $506,000, together with such amounts from
21 other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in
22 the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for
23 such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof,
24 as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a
25 total of $251,179, shall be transferred to and made a part

1 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts
2 not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes
3 enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District
4 of Columbia, $587,955; for preparation and display of
5 exhibits, $46,625 and the preparation, distribution, and dis-
6 play of motion and sound pictures, $59,500, including co-
7 operation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other
8 agencies: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
9 of the appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal
10 year 1945 from which transfers to this appropriation
11 are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below
12 the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget
13 for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred
14 therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which
15 may be expended for personal services in the District of
16 Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
17 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
18 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall
19 determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed
20 by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or
21 authorizations: *Provided further,* That when and to the
22 extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural
23 exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the
24 authorized programs of the various agencies of the Depart-
25 ment can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or

1 distributed by the Office of Information, as the central
2 agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not
3 exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred
4 to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds
5 applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified
6 herein, including personal services in the District of Colum-
7 bia: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion
8 pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a
9 total of $10,000 may be used for the temporary employment,
10 by contract or otherwise, of specialists, technicians, and
11 experts, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as
12 amended: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall
13 be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or
14 State field offices or for the compensation of employees in
15 such offices except that not to exceed $13,900 may be used
16 to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

17 PRINTING AND BINDING

18 For all printing and binding for the Department, in-
19 cluding all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services
20 located in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere,
21 except as otherwise in the Act provided, $1,100,000, includ-
22 ing the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
23 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of
24 the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
25 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915

1 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108),
2 and in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
3 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
4 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
5 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
6 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or
7 sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Sena-
8 tors, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they
9 shall direct, but not including work done at the field print-
10 ing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint
11 Committee on Printing, in accordance with the Act ap-
12 proved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided,*
13 That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from
14 the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agri-
15 cultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary
16 for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas
17 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from
18 funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section
19 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as
20 amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and
21 binding in connection with the activities under said section
22 32, and from funds appropriated for "Salaries and expenses,
23 War Food Administration", such sums as may be necessary
24 for printing and binding in connection with functions as-
25 signed to the Office of Information by the War Food Admin-

1 istrator: *Provided further*, That the total amount that may
2 be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding
3 proviso shall not exceed $385,000.

4 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 Salaries and expenses: For purchase and exchange of
6 reference books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books,
7 periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imper-
8 fect series; not to exceed $1,200 for newspapers; for dues,
9 when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership
10 in societies or associations which issue publications to mem-
11 bers only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers
12 who are not members; for salaries in the city of Washing-
13 ton and elsewhere; for official travel expenses, and for library
14 fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary
15 expenses, $543,233, together with such amounts from other
16 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
17 schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such
18 salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions
19 thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceed-
20 ing a total of $750, shall be transferred to and made a part
21 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation not to
22 exceed $369,070, may be expended for personal services in
23 the District of Columbia: *Provided, however*, That if the total
24 amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

1 year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts
2 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
3 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
4 appropriation and the amount which may be expended for
5 personal services in the District of Columbia shall be in-
6 creased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the
7 Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with repre-
8 sentatives of the Department, shall determine are appro-
9 priate to the requirements as changed by such reductions
10 or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Pro-*
11 *vided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to make
12 copies of bibliographies prepared by the Department library,
13 microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books
14 and other library materials in the Department and sell such
15 bibliographies and reproductions at such prices (not less
16 than estimated cost of furnishing same) as he may deter-
17 mine, the money received from such sales to be deposited
18 in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation.

19 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

20 For the employment of persons and means in the Dis-
21 trict of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in
22 cooperation with public agencies or organizations, including
23 not to exceed $1,826,649 for personal services in the Dis-
24 trict of Columbia, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase

1 of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as
2 follows:

3 Economic investigations: For acquiring and diffusing
4 useful information among the people of the United States, for
5 conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations,
6 and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities
7 of the Department, relative to agricultural production, dis-
8 tribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest
9 aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization
10 of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm
11 population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance
12 and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand
13 for the different farm and food products; land ownership
14 and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to
15 agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends,
16 $2,325,236, together with such amounts from other appro-
17 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
18 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and
19 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
20 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
21 $245,377 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
22 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
23 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
24 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts

1 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
2 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this ap-
3 propriation and the amount which may be expended for per-
4 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or
5 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of
6 the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
7 the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
8 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in
9 such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,*
10 That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made
11 available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be
12 used for State and county land-use planning.

13 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
14 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
15 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and
16 livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
17 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
18 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooper-
19 ation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State,
20 and local agencies, and for the collection and publication of
21 statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June
22 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
23 $1,500,000, together with such amounts from other appro-

1 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
2 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and
3 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
4 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
5 $175,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this
6 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
7 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
8 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts esti-
9 mated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
10 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
11 appropriation and the amount which may be expended for
12 personal services in the District of Columbia shall be in-
13 creased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the
14 Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with repre-
15 sentatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate
16 to the requirements as changed by such reductions or in-
17 creases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided*
18 *further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be
19 available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating,
20 or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
21 acreage to be planted in cotton: *Provided further,* That esti-
22 mates of apple production shall be confined to the commercial
23 crop.

1 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
2 RELATIONS

3 Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the functions
4 of the Secretary under the Act of June 5, 1930, as amended
5 (7 U. S. C. 541–545), independently and in cooperation
6 with other branches of the Government, State agencies, pur-
7 chasing and consuming organizations and persons engaged in
8 the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution
9 of farm and food products, and for enabling the Secretary
10 to discharge his functions as a member of the joint Great
11 Britain-United States board known as the Combined Food
12 Board, including the employment of persons and means in
13 the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase of
14 such books and periodicals and not to exceed $500 for news-
15 papers as may be necessary in connection with this work.
16 $481,505.

17 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
18 COMMITTEES

19 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
20 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
21 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
22 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
23 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
24 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
25 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-

1 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
2 thereto.

3 EXTENSION SERVICE

4 PAYMENTS TO STATES; HAWAII; ALASKA; AND PUERTO RICO

5 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
6 Puerto Rico for cooperative agricultural extension work as
7 follows:

8 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
9 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
10 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
11 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935
12 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; additional extension
13 work, the Act approved April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 589),
14 $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929
15 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-
16 Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3
17 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),
18 extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the
19 Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950;
20 Puerto Rico, the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
21 343f–343g) extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bank-
22 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $140,000; in all, Capper-
23 Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $14,198,950.

24 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

25 Administration and coordination of extension work: For

1 the employment of persons and means in the District of
2 Columbia and elsewhere to enable the Secretary to adminis-
3 ter the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8,
4 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or sup-
5 plementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work
6 of the Department and the several States, Territories, and
7 insular possessions, including cooperation with other bureaus
8 and offices of the Department, and Federal, State, county,
9 and other agencies, in the development, preparation, and
10 distribution of educational material designed to increase the
11 effectiveness of cooperative extension work as conducted by
12 the Department in cooperation with land-grant colleges,
13 $748,843, of which amount not to exceed $632,610 may be
14 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

15 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

16 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and ex-
18 penses of the Office of Administrator, and personal services
19 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

20 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

21 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
22 provisions of an Act entitled "An Act to provide for research
23 into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to
24 provide for the further development of cooperative agricul-
25 tural extension work and the more complete endowment and

1 support of land-grant colleges", approved June 29, 1935
2 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f); for administration of
3 the provisions of section 5 of the said Act, and for special
4 research work, including the planning, programing, co-
5 ordination, and printing the results of such research, to be
6 conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secre-
7 tary may designate or establish, and to which he may make
8 allotments from this fund, including the employment of
9 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
10 $1,226,364, of which amount $742,315 shall be available
11 for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories
12 and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for
13 by section 4 of said Act.

14 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

15 PAYMENT TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

16 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
17 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect
18 the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
19 experiment stations:

20 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
21 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
22 C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
23 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
24 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,463,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $22,500; in all, for Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,001,208: *Provided,* That in order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population, $63,708 of the appropriation in this paragraph under the Bankhead-Jones Act shall be available for allotment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For salaries and expenses, including personal

1 services in the District of Columbia, necessary to enable the
2 Secretary to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved
3 March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May
4 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June
5 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–
6 363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration
7 and for the administration of an agricultural experiment sta-
8 tion in Puerto Rico, $176,169, of which not to exceed
9 $166,122 may be expended for personal services in the
10 District of Columbia; and the Secretary shall prescribe the
11 form of the annual financial statement required under
12 the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are
13 in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the re-
14 search work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment
15 stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research
16 of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon
17 to Congress.

18 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: To enable
19 the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural
20 experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation,
21 illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and
22 not to exceed $8,000 for the erection and alteration of
23 buildings, $107,074; and the Secretary is authorized to
24 sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to
25 the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and

1 the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered
2 into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
3 receipts.

4 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For the employment of persons and means in the District
7 of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
8 $622,550 for departmental personal services in the
9 District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions
10 of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
11 Industry, and related Acts; and the Secretary, upon applica-
12 tion of any exporter, importer, packer, or owner of, or the
13 agent thereof, or dealer in, livestock, hides, skins, meat, or
14 other animal products, may in his discretion, make inspec-
15 tions and examinations at places other than the headquarters
16 of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge
17 the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence in-
18 curred for such inspections and examinations, the funds
19 derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury
20 of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from
21 which the expenses are paid; collect and disseminate infor-
22 mation concerning livestock and animal products; prepare
23 and disseminate reports on animal industry; purchase in the
24 open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins,
25 or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture,

1 which are sold in the United States, for the detection, pre-
2 vention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals,
3 test the same, and disseminate the results of said tests in
4 such manner as he may deem best, and purchase and destroy
5 diseased or exposed animals, including poultry, or quarantine
6 the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the
7 spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, contagious poultry
8 diseases, or other diseases of animals from one State to
9 another, as follows:

10 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
11 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
12 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
13 District of Columbia, $195,379.

14 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
15 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
16 breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural
17 experiment stations and other agencies, including repairs
18 and additions to and erection of buildings necessary to carry
19 on the experiments (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection
20 or alteration of any one building), $899,500.

21 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
22 diseases of animals, including the alteration and construction
23 of necessary buildings, at Beltsville, Maryland (not to exceed
24 $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one building),
25 and necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculin,

1 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $756,939: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That fees shall be charged for all diagnoses in con-
3 nection with rabies, except those performed for agencies of
4 the United States Government, in such amounts as the
5 Secretary shall prescribe, and such fees shall be covered
6 into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

7 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
8 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
9 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
10 disease of cattle, $5,240,355, together with not to exceed
11 $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation
12 for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided,* That in carrying out
13 the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Sec-
14 retary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tubercu-
15 lous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test
16 for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed,
17 condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his dis-
18 cretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations
19 as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or
20 elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary
21 for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals
22 but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money
23 hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners
24 of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary
25 to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or

1 municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take
2 place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as com-
3 pensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time
4 of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof,
5 it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm,
6 or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
7 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further,* That
8 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compen-
9 sation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed
10 one-third of the difference between the appraised value of
11 such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no pay-
12 ment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid
13 by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the
14 animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any
15 payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal
16 or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

17 Hog-cholera control: For the control and eradication of
18 hog cholera and related swine diseases, by such means as
19 may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation
20 of organizations, and other methods, either independently
21 or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county
22 authorities, $114,288.

23 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
24 tine work, including the eradication of southern cattle ticks,
25 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the inspec-

1 tion of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation
2 of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of
3 the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of
4 imported animals, including the establishment and mainte-
5 nance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, im-
6 provements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspec-
7 tion work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
8 and the mallein testing of animals, $951,253.

9 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
10 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food prod-
11 ucts, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps,
12 and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to
13 public printing, $8,616,759.

14 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
15 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
16 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
17 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product
18 manufactured in the United States and the importation of
19 such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
20 animals, $272,115.

21 Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus
22 and serum: The sum of $37,007 of the appropriation
23 made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjust-
24 ment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made avail-
25 able during the fiscal year for which appropriations are

1 herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive,
2 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–
3 855), entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act, and for other purposes", including the employ-
5 ment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and
6 elsewhere.

7 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
8 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

9 In case of an emergency arising out of the existence
10 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
11 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of ani-
12 mals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the
13 livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city
14 of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of
15 appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to ex-
16 ceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such
17 disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past
18 and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with
19 the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of ma-
20 terials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease,
21 wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like
22 or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has
23 complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided,*
24 That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be

1 made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding
2 value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value
3 no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its
4 meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
5 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment
6 by the United States Government for any animals shall not
7 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
8 That the sum of $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the
9 appropriation of $3,500,000 contained in the Second De-
10 ficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1924, approved De-
11 cember 5, 1924, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth
12 disease and other contagious or infectious diseases of animals,
13 is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which
14 appropriations are herein made to enable the Secretary to
15 control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar
16 diseases in poultry.

17 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
19 ing not to exceed $410,345 for personal services in the
20 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in
21 carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924
22 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experi-
23 ments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative
24 investigations of the dairy industry in the various States,
25 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Acts of

1 May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c), 2327 (b)),
2 and August 10, 1912 (26 U. S. C. 2327 (c)), relating
3 to process or renovated butter, and the Act of May 23, 1908
4 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the expor-
5 tation of process or renovated butter, repairs to buildings,
6 and not to exceed $10,000 for the construction or alteration
7 of buildings, $812,958.

8 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND
9 AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For the investigation of fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton,
12 tobacco, vegetables, grasses, forage, drug, medicinal, poison-
13 ous, fiber, and other plants and plant industries, of soils and
14 soil-plant relationships, and of the application of engineering
15 principles to agriculture, in cooperation with other branches of
16 the Department, the State experiment stations, and practical
17 farmers; for the erection or alteration of necessary farm build-
18 ings and buildings at the National Arboretum: *Provided*, That
19 the cost of any building erected or altered, except head houses
20 connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500; and for the
21 employment of persons and means in the city of Washing-
22 ton and elsewhere required for the investigations, experi-
23 ments, and demonstrations herein authorized, as follows:

24 General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses
25 for general administrative purposes, including the salary of

1 Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District
2 of Columbia, $225,000.

3 Agricultural engineering investigations: For investiga-
4 tions, experiments, and demonstrations involving the appli-
5 cation of engineering principles to agriculture; for investi-
6 gating and reporting upon the different kinds of farm power
7 and appliances; upon farm domestic water supply and sewage
8 disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings
9 and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and
10 storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical
11 farm equipment and rural electrification, upon the engineer-
12 ing problems relating to the processing, transportation, and
13 storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and
14 upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical
15 characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm
16 machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the
17 Act approved April 19, 1930 (7 U. S. C. 424, 425); for
18 giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural and chem-
19 ical engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the
20 results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and dis-
21 tributing bulletins, plans, and reports, $293,639.

22 Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and
23 improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of
24 cereal production and for the study and control of cereal
25 diseases, for the investigation of the cultivation and breed-

1 ing of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax
2 diseases, for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn
3 and methods of broomcorn production, and for determining
4 the distribution of weeds and means for their control,
5 $645,596.

6 Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: For investiga-
7 tion of the production of cotton and other fiber crops, including
8 the improvement by cultural methods, breeding, and selec-
9 tion, fiber yield and quality, cotton soil-fertility, and the
10 control of diseases, $456,702, of which sum not less than
11 $14,700 shall be used for experimenting in Sea Island cotton,
12 including its hybridization with other varieties.

13 Drug and related plants: For the investigation, testing,
14 and improvement of plants yielding drugs, spices, poisons,
15 oils, and related products and byproducts, $70,308.

16 Dry-land agriculture: For the investigation and im-
17 provement of methods of crop production under subhumid,
18 semiarid, or dry-land conditions, $245,000: *Provided*, That
19 no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establish-
20 ment of any new field station.

21 Forage crops and diseases: For the investigation and
22 improvement of forage crops, including grasses, alfalfas,
23 clovers, soybeans, lespedezas, vetches, cowpeas, field peas,
24 and miscellaneous legumes; for the investigation of green-
25 manure crops and cover crops; for investigations looking to

1 the improvement of pastures; and for the investigation of
2 forage-crop diseases and methods of control, $327,837.
3 Forest pathology: For the investigation of diseases of
4 forest and shade trees and forest products, including a study
5 of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi, bacteria,
6 viruses, and other causes of such diseases, for the purpose of
7 developing methods of control and eradication and deter-
8 mining their application, $255,300.
9 Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: For investiga-
10 tion and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of
11 culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activi-
12 ties concerned with the production of fruits, nuts, vegetables,
13 ornamentals, and related plants, for investigation of methods
14 of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing and utilizing these
15 products, and for studies of the physiological and related
16 changes of such products during processes of marketing and
17 while in commerical storage, $1,458,877.
18 Irrigation agriculture: For investigations of crop pro-
19 duction on irrigable lands, the quality of irrigation water
20 and its use by crops, and methods for improving and
21 maintaining the productivity of irrigated soils, $145,000.
22 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and devel-
23 opment of the National Arboretum established under the
24 provisions of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Sec-

1 retary of Agriculture to establish a National Arboretum, and
2 for other purposes", approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
3 191–194), employment of persons and means in the city of
4 Washington and elsewhere, and travel expenses of em-
5 ployees and advisory council, $31,500, of which not to
6 exceed $2,500 may be expended by contract or otherwise
7 for the services of consulting landscape architects without
8 reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or
9 civil-service rules.

10 Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: For
11 investigations in seed and plant introduction, including the
12 study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and dis-
13 tribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs,
14 vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from
15 our possessions, and also wild native plants, for experiments
16 with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this
17 country, for plant-disease investigations, including nema-
18 tology, and for plant and plant-disease collections and
19 surveys, $290,000.

20 Plant Industry Experiment Farm: For the maintenance
21 of a general experiment farm and agricultural station in the
22 vicinity of Beltsville, Maryland, $56,976.

23 Soil and fertilizer investigations: For soil and fertilizer
24 investigations, including soil minerals, soil organic matter, soil

1 solution, soil physical and chemical investigations, soil micro-
2 biology, including the testing of cultures procured in the open
3 market for inoculating legumes, other crops, or soil, and if
4 any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or mis-
5 branded, the results of the tests may be published, together
6 with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by
7 whom the cultures were offered for sale; for investigations
8 of the causes of soil infertility and the maintenance of soil
9 productivity; and for investigations within the United States
10 of fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, including phosphoric acid
11 and potash, and other soil amendments, and their suitability
12 for agricultural use, $346,791.

13 Soil survey: For the investigation of soils and their
14 origin, for survey of the extent of classes and types, and
15 for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise,
16 the results of such investigations and surveys, $162,582.

17 Sugar-plant investigations: For sugar-plant investiga-
18 tions, including studies of diseases and the improvement of
19 sugar beets and sugar-beet seed, sugarcane, and other sugar-
20 producing plants, cultural and production methods, and the
21 improvement and maintenance of soil fertility in relation to
22 sugar plants, $370,000.

23 Tobacco investigations: For the investigation and im-
24 provement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production
25 and handling, $131,020.

1 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT
2 QUARANTINE

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses connected with investigations,
5 experiments, and demonstrations for the promotion of eco-
6 nomic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
7 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
8 agriculture, for investigating and importing useful and bene-
9 ficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of in-
10 sects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining
11 the best means of destroying insects affecting man and ani-
12 mals, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
13 visions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as
14 amended (7 U. S. C. 146, 147, 151–167, 281, 282), to
15 conduct other activities hereinafter authorized, and for the
16 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious
17 insects and plant pests, independently or in cooperation with
18 other branches of the Federal Government, States, counties,
19 municipalities, corporations, agencies, individuals, or with
20 foreign governments; including the employment of necessary
21 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
22 of which not to exceed $633,886 may be expended for
23 personal services in the District of Columbia, rent, con-
24 struction, alteration, or repair of necessary buildings outside

1 the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That, unless otherwise
2 specifically provided, the cost for the construction or altera-
3 tion of any building shall not exceed $1,500 and the total
4 amount expended for such construction in any one year shall
5 not exceed $7,000, as follows:

6 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
7 trative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau
8 and other personal services, $160,920.

9 Fruit insects: For insects affecting fruits, grapes, and
10 nuts, $457,230.

11 Japanese beetle control: For the control and preven-
12 tion of spread of the Japanese beetle, $400,000: *Provided,*
13 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the
14 cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

15 Sweetpotato weevil control: For the determination and
16 application of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils
17 as, in the judgment of the Secretary, may be necessary,
18 $78,670: *Provided,* That in the discretion of the Secre-
19 tary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
20 control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State
21 has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this pur-
22 pose: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation
23 shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm
24 crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

25 Mexican fruitfly control: For the control and prevention

1 of spread of the Mexican fruitfly, including necessary surveys
2 and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the
3 Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $169,820.
4 Gypsy and brown-tail moth control: For the control
5 and prevention of spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths,
6 $409,320.
7 Dutch elm disease control: For determining and apply-
8 ing methods of control and prevention of spread of the
9 disease of elm trees known as "Dutch elm disease" and of
10 a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley,
11 $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That, in
12 the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this
13 appropriation shall be made for applying methods of con-
14 trol of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures
15 for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
16 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
17 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential
18 or appropiate for the carrying on of the control program,
19 nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures
20 shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by
21 State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organi-
22 zations concerned: *Provided further*, That expenditures in-
23 curred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not
24 be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions,
25 or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this ap-

1 propriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction
2 of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where
3 such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the
4 Government of the United States, or on property included
5 within local experimental control areas: *Provided further,*
6 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost
7 or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

8 Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication: For deter-
9 mining and applying such methods of eradication, control,
10 and prevention of spread of the diseases of peach trees known
11 as "phony peach" and "peach mosaic" as in the judgment
12 of the Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation
13 with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations
14 of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to
15 accomplish such purposes, including the certification of prod-
16 ucts out of the infested areas to meet the requirements of
17 State quarantines, $99,340: *Provided,* That no part of the
18 money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or
19 value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

20 Forest insects: For insects affecting forests and forest
21 products, under section 4 of the Act approved May 22, 1928
22 (16 U. S. C. 581c), entitled "An Act to insure adequate
23 supplies of timber and other forest products for the people
24 of the United States, to promote the full use for timber grow-
25 ing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States,

1 including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not
2 suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correla-
3 tion and the most economical conduct of forest research in
4 the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforest-
5 ation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest eco-
6 nomics, and related subjects", and for insects affecting orna-
7 mental trees and shrubs, $202,000.

8 Truck crop and garden insects: For insects affecting truck
9 crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco,
10 sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $326,340.

11 Cereal and forage insects: For insects affecting cereal
12 and forage crops, including sugarcane and rice, and including
13 research on the European corn borer, $403,370.

14 Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the com-
15 mon barberry and for applying such other methods of
16 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of cereal
17 rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary
18 to accomplish such purposes, $258,470: *Provided,* That,
19 in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from
20 this appropriation shall be made for these purposes until a
21 sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have
22 been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
23 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
24 tions for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*
25 *further,* That no part of the money herein appropriated

1 shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured
2 or destroyed.

3 Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $163,730.

4 Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the
5 control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil
6 and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such
7 cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any
8 infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations
9 in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or
10 local Mexican authorities, $738,960.

11 Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and
12 the propagation and distribution by sale of surplus bee-breed-
13 ing stock, $91,950: *Provided,* That the rates at which such
14 sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary
15 and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treas-
16 ury as miscellaneous receipts.

17 Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting
18 man, household possessions, and animals, $175,000.

19 Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identifica-
20 tion and classification of insects, including taxonomic, mor-
21 phological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the
22 maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and
23 dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other
24 agencies concerned with insect-pest control, $145,000.

25 Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in con-

1 nection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious
2 insects and related pests and for the exchange with other
3 countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods,
4 $20,000.

5 Control investigations: For developing equipment or
6 apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication
7 and control of plant pests, determining methods of disin-
8 fecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests,
9 determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases
10 of insect-pest control, $76,485, of which not less than
11 $10,000 shall be used for methyl bromide investigations.

12 Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the inves-
13 tigation and development of methods of manufacturing
14 insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical
15 problems relating to the composition, action, and applica-
16 tion of insecticides and fungicides, $130,520.

17 Transit inspection: For the inspection in transit or
18 otherwise of articles quarantined under the Act of August
19 20, 1912 (7 U. S. C. 161, 164a), as amended, and for the
20 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
21 transported interstate in violation of quarantines promulgated
22 thereunder, $45,900.

23 Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign
24 plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export,
25 and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from

1 shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured
2 or destroyed.

3 Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $163,730.

4 Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the
5 control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil
6 and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such
7 cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any
8 infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations
9 in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or
10 local Mexican authorities, $738,960.

11 Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and
12 the propagation and distribution by sale of surplus bee-breed-
13 ing stock, $91,950: *Provided,* That the rates at which such
14 sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary
15 and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treas-
16 ury as miscellaneous receipts.

17 Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting
18 man, household possessions, and animals, $175,000.

19 Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identifica-
20 tion and classification of insects, including taxonomic, mor-
21 phological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the
22 maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and
23 dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other
24 agencies concerned with insect-pest control, $145,000.

25 Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in con-

1 nection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious
2 insects and related pests and for the exchange with other
3 countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods,
4 $20,000.

5 Control investigations: For developing equipment or
6 apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication
7 and control of plant pests, determining methods of disin-
8 fecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests,
9 determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases
10 of insect-pest control, $76,485, of which not less than
11 $10,000 shall be used for methyl bromide investigations.

12 Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the inves-
13 tigation and development of methods of manufacturing
14 insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical
15 problems relating to the composition, action, and applica-
16 tion of insecticides and fungicides, $130,520.

17 Transit inspection: For the inspection in transit or
18 otherwise of articles quarantined under the Act of August
19 20, 1912 (7 U. S. C. 161, 164a), as amended, and for the
20 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
21 transported interstate in violation of quarantines promulgated
22 thereunder, $45,900.

23 Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign
24 plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export,
25 and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from

1 Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of
2 the entry into the United States of railway cars and other
3 vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials
4 from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection
5 thereof, including construction and repair of necessary build-
6 ings, plants, and equipment, for the fumigation, disinfection,
7 or cleaning of products, railway cars, or other vehicles enter-
8 ing the United States from Mexico, $797,700: *Provided,*
9 That any moneys received in payment of charges fixed by
10 the Secretary on account of such cleaning and disinfection
11 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
12 Certification of exports: For the inspection, under such
13 rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, of
14 domestic plants and plant products when offered for export
15 and to certify to shippers and interested parties as to the
16 freedom of such products from injurious plant diseases and
17 insect pests according to the sanitary requirements of the
18 foreign countries affected and to make such reasonable
19 charges and to use such means as may be necessary to ac-
20 complish this object, $34,480: *Provided,* That moneys
21 received on account of such inspection and certification shall
22 be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
23 CONTROL OF INCIPIENT AND EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF
24 INSECT PESTS AND PLANT DISEASES
25 Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect

1 pests and plant diseases: To enable the Secretary to carry
2 out the provisions of and for expenditures authorized by
3 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
4 148–148e), including surveys and control operations in
5 Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or
6 local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian
7 citizens, $2,700,000.

8 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL
9 CHEMISTRY

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations
12 hereinafter authorized, independently or in cooperation with
13 other branches of the Department, other departments or
14 agencies of the Federal Government, States, State agricul-
15 tural experiment stations, universities, and other State
16 agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business,
17 farm, or other organizations and corporations, individuals,
18 associations, and scientific societies, including the employ-
19 ment of necessary persons and means in the city of Wash-
20 ington and elsewhere, of which not to exceed $198,280 may
21 be expended for personal services in the District of Colum-
22 bia; and for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings out-
23 side the District of Columbia at a total cost not to exceed
24 $15,000, as follows:

25 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-

1 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
2 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
3 District of Columbia, $82,250.

4 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
5 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
6 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of
7 chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physi-
8 cal, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods,
9 feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances
10 used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the
11 physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of
12 such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and
13 development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar
14 sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural
15 materials for such purposes; for the technological investiga-
16 tion of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen
17 pack investigations; and to cooperate with associations and
18 scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis,
$313,411.

19 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
20 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
21 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
22 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
23 stores; the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and
24 utilization of naval stores; and for the assembling and com-
25 pilation of data on production, distribution, and consumption

1 of turpentine and rosin, pursuant to the Act of August 15,
2 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), $112,100.

3 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the
4 researches established under the provisions of section 202
5 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II, and subject to the
6 provisions of section 393 of title III, of the Agricultural
7 Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292, 1393),
8 including research on food products of farm commodities,
9 $4,244,600.

10 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME
11 ECONOMICS

12 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
13 ing not to exceed $222,905 for personal services in the
14 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition
15 and Home Economics for conducting either independently
16 or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of
17 the relative utility and economy of agricultural products
18 for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special
19 suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective
20 utilization of such products for these purposes, and such
21 economic investigations, including housing and household
22 buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the
23 rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this
24 subject, $806,630.

1 BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER

2 For general administrative purposes, including main-
3 tenance, operation, construction, or alteration of necessary
4 buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500 for any one build-
5 ing, repairs, and other expenses, $130,760: *Provided*, That
6 the appropriation current at the time services are rendered
7 may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements
8 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
9 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and other
10 related services, for equipment rentals (including depre-
11 ciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
12 equipment and materials furnished, stores of which may
13 be maintained at the Center, and for building construction,
14 alteration, and repair performed by the Center in carrying
15 out the purposes of such applicable appropriations and the
16 applicable appropriations may also be charged their pro-
17 portionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
18 Center not covered by this appropriation.

19 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

20 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
21 out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act for forest pro-
22 of Columbia, and to enable the Secretary to experiment
23 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), and in accordance with the
24 provisions thereof, including the employment of persons and
25 means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere. $2,264,026;

line omitted

1 of which amount $203,173 shall be available to the
2 Department of the Interior for control of white pine
3 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the juris-
4 diction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which
5 are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of
6 the United States; $1,219,900 of said amount to the
7 Forest Service for the control of white pine blister
8 rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and
9 $840,953 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology
10 and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordina-
11 tion of the entire program, method development, and
12 for operations conducted under its direction for such con-
13 trol, including, but not confined to, cooperation with
14 individual States, local authorites and private agencies in the
15 control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State
16 and privately owned lands.

17 FOREST SERVICE

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For the employment of persons and means in the Dis-
20 trict of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
21 $887,074 for departmental personal services in the District
22 of Columbia, and to enable the Secretary to experiment
23 and to make and continue investigations and report on for-
24 estry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no
25 part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment

1 or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to
2 advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the
3 same; to investigate and test American timber and timber
4 trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treat-
5 ment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the plant-
6 ing of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the tree-
7 less regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the
8 cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,
9 exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply
10 or sanitary system and of connecting the same with
11 any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower
12 upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not
13 exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected,
14 purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or
15 more, may be improved out of the appropriations made
16 under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to
17 exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified
18 by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the
19 national forests, including tree planting and other measures
20 to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the
21 formation of floods, and to conserve water and including
22 the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary
23 for information leading to the arrest and conviction for
24 violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or
25 near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury

1 to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions
2 upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care
3 for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or
4 the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate
5 the results of experiments and investigations made by the
6 Forest Service; to purchase lawbooks, reference and tech-
7 nical books, and technical journals for officers of the Forest
8 Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical
9 supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the
10 immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees
11 engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service:
12 *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,500 may be
13 expended for the contribution of the United States to the
14 cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Union
15 of Forest Research Stations and of the Department of
16 Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois:
17 *Provided further*, That the appropriations for the work of
18 the Forest Service shall be available for meeting the expenses
19 of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and
20 handling of supplies, equipment, and materials stored therein
21 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Forest
22 Service and for sale and distribution to other Government
23 activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate
24 with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written
25 cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment,

1 and materials, including the cost of supervision, transporta-
2 tion, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appro-
3 priations current at the time additional supplies and materials
4 are procured for warehouse stocks: *Provided further*, That
5 the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service avail-
6 able for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replace-
7 ment of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for
8 use of such equipment on projects of the Forest Service
9 chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other
10 Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reim-
11 bursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the
12 work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief
13 Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation,
14 repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment manage-
15 ment control, and credited to appropriations currently avail-
16 able at the time adjustment is effected: *Provided further*,
17 That the Forest Service may rent equipment for fire-control
18 purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal
19 agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control
20 under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the
21 amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropria-
22 tions currently available at the time payment is received,
23 as follows:

24 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
25 penses for general administrative purposes, including the

1 salary of the Chief Forester, for the necessary expenses of
2 the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized
3 by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
4 514), and for other personal services in the District of
5 Columbia, $625,000.

6 National forest protection and management: For the
7 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
8 and development of the national forests, including the
9 establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries,
10 including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
11 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
12 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
13 maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract
14 or otherwise, with authority to renew any contract for
15 such purpose annually, not more than twice, without addi-
16 tional advertising; the maintenance of roads and trails and
17 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
18 necessary for the proper and economical administration,
19 protection, development, and use of the national forests,
20 including experimental areas under Forest Service administra-
21 tion, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary,
22 direct purchases will be more economical than construction,
23 improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to
24 exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and
25 maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control

1 of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cul-
2 tural operations; development and application of fish
3 and game management plans; propagation and transplant-
4 ing of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions
5 of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber
6 and other resources and development and application
7 of plans for their effective management, sale, and use;
8 acceptance of moneys from timber purchasers for de-
9 posit into the Treasury in the trust account, Forest Service
10 Cooperative Fund, which moneys are hereby appropriated
11 and made available until expended for scaling services
12 requested by purchasers in addition to those required by the
13 Forest Service, and for refunds of amounts deposited in
14 excess of the cost of such work; examination, classification,
15 surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting ex-
16 changes authorized by law and of lands within the
17 boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to
18 homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
19 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
20 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
21 512); investigation and establishment of water rights,
22 including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in
23 lands or rights-of-ways for use and protection of water
24 rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the admin-
25 istration and public use of the national forests; and all

1 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
2 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
3 including lands under contract for purchase or for the
4 acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been
5 instituted under the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
6 521), and the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499,
7 505, 561–570), lands transferred by authority of the Secre-
8 tary from the Resettlement Administration to the Forest
9 Service, and lands transferred to the Forest Service under
10 authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
11 $17,729,426: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be avail-
12 able for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of
13 persons who have lost their lives as a result of fighting fires
14 while employed by the Forest Service: *Provided further*,
15 That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood,
16 and other forest products the amounts made available for
17 schools and roads by the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C.
18 500), and the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501),
19 shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber.
20 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
21 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
22 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
23 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
24 unappropriated public forest lands, $100,000, which amount

1 shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preced-
2 ing fiscal year.

3 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
4 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
5 entitled "An Act to insure adequate supplies of timber and
6 other forest products for the people of the United States,
7 to promote the full use for timber growing and other pur-
8 poses of forest lands in the United States, including farm
9 wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agri-
10 cultural production, and to secure the correlation and the
11 most economical conduct of forest research in the Depart-
12 ment of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber
13 growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related
14 subjects", approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C.
15 581, 581a, 581f–581i), as follows:

16 Forest management: Fire, silvicultural, and other forest
17 investigations and experiments under said section 2, as
18 amended, at forest experiment stations or elsewhere,
19 $498,848.

20 Range investigations: Investigations and experiments to
21 develop improved methods of management of forest and
22 other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment
23 stations or elsewhere, $288,475.

24 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests

1 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
2 Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,092,519.

3 Forest survey: A comprehensive forest survey under
4 section 9, $156,246.

5 Forest economics: Investigations in forest economics
6 under section 10, $74,018.

7 Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at
8 forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and
9 demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover char-
10 acteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water
11 conservation, flood control, stream-flow regulation, erosion,
12 climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for de-
13 veloping preventive and control measures therefor, $86,762.

14 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

15 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
16 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
17 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
18 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act en-
19 titled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for
20 the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of
21 national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote
22 the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable
23 therefor", approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C.
24 564–570), $2,500,000, and in addition thereto $29,602 to
25 carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of

1943; in all, $2,529,602, of which not to exceed $64,226 and $5,000 shall be available for personal services and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively, in the District of Columbia.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $532,038) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,728), of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance

1 of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not
2 to exceed $781,466, of which not to exceed $50,958 may
3 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia;
4 the purchase of reference books and technical journals;
5 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or
6 purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
7 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is avail-
8 able for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and
9 sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924,
10 shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the
11 State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or in-
12 dividuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that
13 to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make
14 contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to
15 be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any
16 part of this appropriation allocated for the production or
17 procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds
18 appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to co-
19 operating States for the production or procurement of nursery
20 stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more
21 than three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying
22 into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry
23 Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish
24 new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such
25 new nurseries.

1 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

2 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
3 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
4 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, of which not to exceed
5 $20,030 may be expended for personal services in the Dis-
6 trict of Columbia.

7 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

8 For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the
9 Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23
10 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and
11 maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under
12 Forest Service administration, including not to exceed
13 $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
14 $4,161,496 for forest development roads and trails, to be
15 immediately available and to remain available until expended:
16 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the
17 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
18 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and sup-
19 plies used for road and trail construction and maintenance,
20 but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered,
21 or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed
22 $7,500.

23 EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

24 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
25 carry into effect the Act of March 5, 1942, as amended

1 (7 U. S. C. 171–175), including personal services in the
2 District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding
3 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and
5 periodicals; purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; erection
6 of necessary buildings; procurement of medical supplies or
7 services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance
8 of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, and furnish-
9 ing to employees daily transportation between points of
10 assembly and work projects, including the cost of progres-
11 sive and final liquidation of all of said project during the
12 fiscal year 1945, there is hereby continued available, in
13 accordance with section 3 of said Act of March 5, 1942,
14 not to exceed $3,952,585 of the unobligated balances of
15 appropriations made under this head for the fiscal years
16 1942 and 1943, which balances shall be merged with the
17 appropriation made under this head in the Department of
18 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided*, That any
19 proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from
20 guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales,
21 rentals, and fees resulting from operations under such Act
22 of March 5, 1942, as amended, shall be covered into the
23 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

24 WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

25 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable

1 the War Food Administration to perform its functions, in-
2 cluding those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310,
3 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by
4 transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private
5 agencies and individuals, other personal services in the
6 District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with
7 the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and com-
8 pensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjust-
9 ment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the tem-
10 porary employment of persons or organizations by contract
11 or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of
12 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary
13 expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of sub-
14 sistence, of persons serving while away from their perma-
15 nent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by
16 the War Food Administration, without other compensation
17 from the United States, except that such expenditures shall
18 not exceed $200,000; printing and binding; the purchase of
19 lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed
20 $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and
21 maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia)
22 of passenger-carrying vehicles; $29,200,000: *Provided,*
23 That the applicable appropriations available to the War
24 Food Administration, current at the time services are ren-
25 dered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed

1 by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by
2 advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or esti-
3 mated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration,
4 incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such non-
5 governmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided*
6 *further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall
7 be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under
8 which assessments are made against producers or handlers
9 of agricultural products for administration of such orders:
10 *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall
11 be used for agricultural wage stabilization.

12 COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

13 Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed
14 $5,458,526 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation
15 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Cor-
16 poration in carrying out its activities as authorized by law,
17 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
18 elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standard-
19 ized Government Travel Regulations and the Act of June 3,
20 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and
21 binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed
22 $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; procurement
23 of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the District
24 of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
25 *Provided,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and

1 special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but
2 not including other personal services) in connection with the
3 acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dis-
4 position of any real or personal property belonging to the
5 Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses
6 of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as
7 nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Pro-*
8 *vided further,* That none of the fund made available by this
9 paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until
10 an appropriate appropriation account shall have been estab-
11 lished therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a
12 covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be ac-
13 counted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and
14 Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further,*
15 That none of the fund made available by this paragraph
16 shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the
17 sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks
18 of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by
19 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable
20 price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1,
21 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–8) : *Provided further,*
22 That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other dis-
23 position of any agricultural commodity substantially deterio-
24 rated in quality (or in the case of perishable commodities if
25 there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks)

1 or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut
2 oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or
3 byproduct uses: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn
4 shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price
5 of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*,
6 That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of
7 corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in
8 any area than the United States average parity price of
9 corn.

10 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL
11 LAND RESOURCES

12 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
13 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclu-
14 sive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act,
15 approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C.
16 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjust-
17 ment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407)
18 (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and
19 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including per-
20 sonal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not
21 to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of ex-
22 hibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and inter-
23 national fairs within the United States; purchase of law-
24 books, books of reference, periodicals, $290,000,000, to
25 remain available until December 31, 1945, for compliance

1 with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural
2 Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of Feb-
3 ruary 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of
4 the 1944 programs carried out during the period July 1,
5 1943, to December 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided*, That
6 no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation
7 in this Act shall be used for incentive or production ad-
8 justment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-
9 conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment
10 commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricul-
11 tural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enu-
12 merated and set forth in the "1943 Agricultural Conserva-
13 tion Program" bulletin, dated December 3, 1942: *Provided*
14 *further*, That not to exceed $24,250,000 of said amount shall
15 be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other ad-
16 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not
17 more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the
18 schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the
19 appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricul-
20 tural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred: *Provided*
21 *further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or
22 made available for the functions assigned to the Agricul-
23 tural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
24 (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
25 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information

1 employees or any State or county information employees,
2 but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or sup-
3 plying of information to individual farmers: *Provided fur-*
4 *ther*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and
5 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-
6 lation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-build-
7 ing practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under
8 the Act of February 29, 1936, and like programs under the
9 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total
10 expenditures of which, including administration, shall not
11 exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, ferti-
12 lizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand
13 at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants
14 under the 1945 program; but the payments or grants under
15 such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of
16 land with respect to which such payments or grants are
17 to be made, in conformity with farming practices which
18 will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-
19 water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective
20 manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as
21 determined and approved by the State Committee of the
22 Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States:
23 *Provided further*, That no part of such amounts shall
24 be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and
25 other administrative expenses except for payment of ob-

1 ligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Pro-*
2 *vided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion,
3 from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office
4 such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative ex-
5 penses of the General Accounting Office in auditing pay-
6 ments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount
7 shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime,
8 trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing
9 services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers
10 to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by
11 the Secretary in the 1944 and 1945 programs under said
12 Act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimburse-
13 ment of any Federal, State, or local government agency
14 for such materials, or services, and for the payment of all
15 expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or
16 part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided*
17 *further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law,
18 persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as
19 tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United
20 States Government and who comply with the terms and condi-
21 tions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, form-
22 ulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said Act
23 of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and
24 receive payments for their participation in said program to
25 the same extent as other producers: *Provided further*, That

1 no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the
2 Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau
3 or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used
4 to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages
5 in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but
6 not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign
7 funds of political parties or to any organization, association,
8 corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or in-
9 fluencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political
10 office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or
11 contributions for the distribution of publications and other
12 literature designed to influence or aid in the election or
13 defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in
14 activities designed to influence the action of Congress with
15 respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except
16 that employees may furnish to Congress any information
17 authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by
18 Congress, or by any of its committees or members.

19 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

20 Administrative and operating expenses: For operating
21 and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insur-
22 ance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7
23 U. S. C. 1501–1518), including the employment of persons
24 and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, print-
25 ing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference,

1 and periodicals, there is hereby reappropriated not to exceed
2 $100,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation
3 made for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30,
4 1944: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall
5 be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat
6 and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for
7 any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation
8 of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted
9 prior to July 31, 1943.

10 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

11 To carry out the provisions of an Act entitled "An Act
12 to provide for the protection of land resources against soil
13 erosion, and for other purposes", approved April 27, 1935
14 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national
15 program of erosion control and soil and moisture conserva-
16 tion to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other
17 agencies, including the employment of persons and means
18 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to
19 exceed $1,089,837, may be expended for personal serv-
20 ices in the District of Columbia, purchase of books
21 and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one
22 passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia,
23 furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees,
24 and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent
25 buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased,

1 erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing
2 a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same
3 with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where
4 buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being pur-
5 chased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to
6 be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
7 *Provided further,* That no money appropriated in this Act
8 shall be available for the construction of any such building
9 on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further,*
10 That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are
11 herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil
12 Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the
13 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,
14 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment
15 stored therein for distribution to projects under the super-
16 vision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and
17 distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such
18 supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (in-
19 cluding the cost of transportation and handling) to be reim-
20 bursed to appropriations current at the time additional
21 supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the
22 appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such
23 supplies, materials, or equipment, as follows:
24 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
25 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects

1 of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil
2 and moisture conservation (including the construction and
3 hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage); and
4 for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental
5 watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations,
6 $1,225,000.

7 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preven-
8 tive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such
9 special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and
10 the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of
11 farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and
12 operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation
13 plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
14 $28,340,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appro-
15 priation may be expended for soil and water con-
16 servation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided*
17 *further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for
18 the production or procurement of nursery stock by any
19 Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency
20 for allocation to cooperating States for the production or
21 procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for
22 expenditure for not more than three fiscal years.

23 Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For
24 research and demonstration work in soil conservation
25 control measures, including research and demonstration work

1 in fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate
2 fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $72,248:
3 *Provided,* That no expenditures shall be made for these pur-
4 poses until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall
5 have been made available by the State of Florida, or a
6 political subdivision thereof, for the same purposes.

7 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
8 SUBMARGINAL LAND

9 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
10 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
11 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), including the em-
12 ployment of persons and means in the District of Columbia
13 and elsewhere, $1,250,000.

14 SUGAR ACT

15 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions,
16 other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands,
17 of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as
18 amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including the employ-
19 ment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and
20 elsewhere, as authorized by said Act, $52,510,203, to remain
21 available until June 30, 1946.

22 MARKETING SERVICE

23 For the employment of such persons and means in the
24 city of Washington and elsewhere (including not to exceed
25 $1,408,617 for departmental personal services in the Dis-

1 trict of Columbia) as may be necessary in conducting in-
2 vestigations, experiments, and demonstrations, either inde-
3 pendently or in cooperation with public or private agencies,
4 organizations, or individuals, as follows:

5 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
6 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely infor-
7 mation on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
8 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
9 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
10 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and
11 their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and
12 other agricultural products, independently and in coopera-
13 tion with other branches of the Government, State agencies,
14 purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons en-
15 gaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and dis-
16 tribution of farm and food products, $1,267,290.

17 Market inspection of farm products: For enabling
18 the Secretary, independently and in cooperation with other
19 branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and
20 consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of com-
21 merce, or other associations of businessmen or trade organiza-
22 tions, and persons or corporations engaged in the production,
23 transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food
24 products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions,
25 to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested

1 parties the class, quality, and condition of cotton, tobacco,
2 fruits, and vegetables, whether raw, dried, canned, or other-
3 wise processed, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm
4 products when offered for interstate shipment or when re-
5 ceived at such important central markets as the Secretary may
6 from time to time designate, or at points which may be con-
7 veniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations
8 as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be
9 reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for
10 the service rendered: *Provided,* That officers and employees
11 who, under proper authorization, use privately owned motor
12 vehicles in the performance of official travel within the
13 corporate limits of their official stations for the purpose of
14 inspecting and grading farm and food products and the
15 supervision thereof at points located within the said cor-
16 porate limits may be reimbursed for such travel at a rate
17 not to exceed 3 cents per mile: *Provided further,* That
18 certificates issued by the authorized agents of the Depart-
19 ment shall be received in all courts of the United States
20 as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein
21 contained, $547,679.

22 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
23 among the people of the United States useful information
24 relative to the standardization, classification, grading, prep-
25 aration for market, handling, and marketing of farm and

1 food products, including the demonstration and promotion
2 of the use of uniform standards of classification of American
3 farm and food products throughout the world, and for making
4 analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7,
5 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), $451,500: *Provided,* That
6 samples, illustrations, practical forms, or sets of the grades
7 recommended or promulgated by the Secretary for farm or
8 food products may be sold under such rules and regulations
9 as he may prescribe, and the receipts therefrom deposited
10 in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

11 Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards
12 Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
13 visions of an Act entitled "An Act to establish and promote
14 the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide
15 and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for
16 other purposes", approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C.
17 511–511q), and an Act entitled "An Act to provide for
18 the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the
19 Department of Agriculture", approved January 14, 1929
20 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, $933,500.

21 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
22 and Standard Container Acts: To enable the Secretary to
23 carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural
24 Commodities Act, approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7
25 U. S. C. 499a–499r), and the Act to prevent the

1 destruction or dumping of farm produce, and for other
2 purposes, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491–
3 497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916,
4 as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the Act to fix stand-
5 ards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets
6 for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes, approved
7 May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $210,000.

8 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts:
9 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of
10 the Act authorizing him to collect and publish statistics of
11 the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3,
12 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
13 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by
14 chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton
15 futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect
16 the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act,
17 approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
18 including such means as may be necessary for effectuating
19 agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and
20 other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the
21 adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton
22 classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes
23 with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution,
24 inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies
25 thereof under such agreements, $1,210,783.

1 United States Grain Standards Act: To enable the
2 Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United
3 States Grain Standards Act, $860,999.

4 United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary
5 to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Ware-
6 house Act, $533,930.

7 Federal Seed Act: To enable the Secretary to carry
8 into effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to
9 regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require
10 labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in inter-
11 state commerce; to require certain standards with respect to
12 certain imported seeds; and for other purposes", approved
13 August 9, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 1561–1610), $117,700: *Pro-*
14 *vided,* That not to exceed $250 of this amount may be used
15 for meeting the share of the United States in the expenses
16 of the International Seed Testing Congress in carrying out
17 plans for correlating the work of the various adhering gov-
18 ernments on problems relating to seed analysis or other
19 subjects which the Congress may determine to be necessary
20 in the interest of international seed trade.

21 Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the pro-
22 visions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
23 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
24 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $418,700.

25 Naval Stores Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry

1 into effect the provisions of the Naval Stores Act of March
2 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 91–99), $34,728.
3 Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry
4 into effect the provisions of the Act of April 26, 1910 (7
5 U. S. C. 121–134), entitled "An Act for preventing the
6 manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or mis-
7 branded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and
8 also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other
9 purposes", $215,208.
10 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary to
11 carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange
12 Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), and as further
13 amended by the Act of October 9, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 2),
14 $348,797.
15 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the
16 provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II
17 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C.
18 1291), $78,762.
19 FARM TENANCY
20 To enable the Secretary through the War Food Admin-
21 istration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the
22 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
23 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:
24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in con-
25 nection with the making of loans under title I of the

1 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
2 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due
3 the United States on account of loans heretofore made under
4 the provisions of said Act, including the employment of
5 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
6 exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said
7 Act, $750,000.

8 Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance
9 with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
10 approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006),
11 $15,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Re-
12 construction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3
13 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used
14 for making loans under the terms of said Act for the pur-
15 chase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit
16 of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality
17 in which such purchase may be made, which value shall
18 be determined solely according to statistics of the farm
19 census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
20 poration is hereby authorized and directed to lend such
21 sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obliga-
22 tions of borrowers from the Secretary under the pro-
23 visions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
24 Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006):
25 *Provided,* That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction

1 Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the
2 principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting
3 the security therefor: *Provided further,* That the Secretary
4 may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest
5 on any loans made under such title I to repay the Recon-
6 struction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed there-
7 from under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further,*
8 That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such
9 obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation
10 is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding
11 at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by
12 an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

13 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

14 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
15 sions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved
16 May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), as
17 follows:

18 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and
19 expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports
20 including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrifica-
21 tion Administration, and other personal services in the Dis-
22 trict of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange
23 of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and
24 periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to
25 exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $2,550,000.

1 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
2 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses
3 incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section
4 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as
5 amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

6 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Admin-
9 istration in the District of Columbia and the field, including
10 printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to
11 exceed $5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority
12 attending meetings or conventions of members of organiza-
13 tions at which matters of importance to the work of the
14 Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or trans-
15 acted; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $750
16 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic
17 reporting services; library membership fees or dues in
18 organizations which issue publications to members only or
19 to members at a lower price than to others, payment for
20 which may be made in advance; not to exceed $10,000 for
21 purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by
22 personal service without regard to the provisions of any
23 other Act; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation
24 of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in the District
25 of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of

1 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
2 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
3 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
4 without other compensation from the United States, in an
5 advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except
6 that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; not to ex-
7 ceed $10,000 for employment of persons, firms, and others for
8 the performance of special services, including legal services;
9 necessary administrative expenses in connection with the
10 making of loans under the provisions of the Act of January
11 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), and the collec-
12 tion of moneys due the United States on account of loans
13 made under the provisions of said Act and similar Acts
14 administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating
15 to loans for crop production, feed, seed, and harvesting;
16 examination of corporations, banks, associations, and in-
17 stitutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm
18 Credit Administration: *Provided,* That hereafter the ex-
19 penses and salaries of employees engaged in such exam-
20 inations shall be assessed against the said corporations,
21 banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of
22 existing laws except that the amounts collected from the
23 Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal in-
24 termediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916,
25 as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the

1 Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administra-
2 tion shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administra-
3 tion of the administrative supervision of the Federal land
4 banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate
5 credit banks, and the production credit corporations for
6 each fiscal year and shall apportion the amount so
7 determined among such banks and corporations on such equi-
8 table basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall
9 assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks
10 and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered
11 into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which
12 fund is hereby made available to said Administration for
13 expenditure for the purposes set forth in its annual
14 appropriation: *Provided further,* That as soon as practicable
15 after June 30 of each fiscal year said Administration
16 shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the
17 cost of the examination services rendered during such
18 fiscal year to each Federal land bank, joint stock
19 land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2)
20 the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated
21 to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal in-
22 termediate credit bank, and production credit corporation
23 as the cost during such fiscal year of their administrative
24 supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case
25 is greater than the total amount collected from the bank

1 or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be
2 collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be
3 refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation
4 entitled thereto; in all, $626,321, together with not to ex-
5 ceed $4,459,480 from the funds made available to the
6 Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the Act of January
7 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o).

8 Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans: For
9 loans to farmers under the Act of January 29, 1937 (12
10 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), as amended by the Acts of
11 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
12 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
13 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
14 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), the un-
15 obligated balance (exclusive of the amount of such balance
16 made available for "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Ad-
17 ministration, 1945") of the appropriation "Crop production
18 and harvesting loans" as made in the First Deficiency Ap-
19 propriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (Act of February 9, 1937,
20 Public Law 4), and as continued available by the Acts of
21 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
22 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
23 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
24 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), is
25 hereby made available, together with all collections of prin-

1 cipal and interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made
2 under said Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–
3 1020n, 1020o).

4 FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

5 Not to exceed $8,200,000 of the funds of the Federal
6 Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the Act of
7 January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h), shall be
8 available during the fiscal year 1945 for administrative
9 expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in
10 the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses of
11 officers and employees of the Corporation, in accordance
12 with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and
13 the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833);
14 printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, and not
15 to exceed $250 for periodicals and newspapers; contract
16 stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies,
17 equipment, and services; purchase, maintenance, repair, and
18 operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to
19 be used only for official purposes; rent in the District of
20 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
21 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
22 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
23 without other compensation from the United States, in an
24 advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a con-
25 tract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the

1 performance of special services, including legal services; use
2 of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national
3 farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies
4 of the Government as authorized by said Act of January
5 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
6 *Provided,* That all expenditures which under the accounting
7 system prescribed for the Corporation by the General
8 Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments,
9 increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real
10 estate and chattel), shall be considered as nonadministrative
11 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That
12 except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified,
13 and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the admin-
14 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation
15 shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the
16 provisions of said Act of January 31, 1934, as amended
17 (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

18 GENERAL PROVISIONS

19 SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this
20 Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to
21 pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee
22 of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office,
23 agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation,
24 institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or
25 approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or em-

1 ployee of the Department or of any such bureau, office,
2 agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to
3 make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the pro-
4 visions of food production financing bulletins F–1 or F–2,
5 issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under
6 the Food Production Administration, Production Loans
7 Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the
8 applicant represents in writing and it is administratively
9 determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the
10 production of the crops or livestock specified in the appli-
11 cation is not available to him from sources other than the
12 Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from
13 other sources only on such terms and conditions that he
14 could not use the other credit available to the extent neces-
15 sary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or live-
16 stock specified in his application and (b) the person author-
17 ized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional
18 Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity
19 of the crops or livestock specified in the application would
20 be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than
21 would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance
22 under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency
23 Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148),
24 as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins
25 F–1 and F–2 made or approved on the conditions specified

1 in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or
2 advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of
3 the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within
4 one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region
5 which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated
6 as a region in which the making of such loans or advances
7 is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or
8 livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such
9 region: *Provided,* That none of the limitations provided for
10 by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance
11 made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing
12 the completion of production undertaken before July 12,
13 1943, or for the purpose of protecting or preserving
14 the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of
15 any loan or advance made or approved before such date.

16 SEC. 3. Not to exceed 7 per centum of the foregoing
17 amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any
18 bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be
19 available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects
20 included within the general expenses of such bureau,
21 division, or office, but no more than 7 per centum shall be
22 added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of
23 extraordinary emergency.

24 SEC. 4. During the fiscal year for which appropriations
25 are herein made the head of any department or independent

1 establishment of the Government requiring inspections,
2 analyses, and tests of food and other products, within the
3 scope of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and
4 which that Department is unable to perform within the limits
5 of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary,
6 transfer to the Department for direct expenditure such sums
7 as may be necessary for the performance of such work.

8 SEC. 5. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the
9 lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department
10 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and
11 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the
12 conduct of the field work of the Department outside the Dis-
13 trict of Columbia: *Provided*, That such vehicles shall be used
14 only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but
15 this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of
16 motortrucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*,
17 That appropriations contained in this Act shall be available
18 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled
19 and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided fur-*
20 *ther*, That the funds available to the Agricultural Adjust-
21 ment Agency may be used for the maintenance, repair, and
22 operation of one passenger-carrying vehicle in the District
23 of Columbia.

24 SEC. 6. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
25 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary

1 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
2 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of
3 emergency of persons in the field service of the Department
4 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
5 on the emergency rubber project; (4) employment by the
6 Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed twenty
7 junior engineer trainees who are citizens of other American
8 republics; and (5) employment under the appropriation for
9 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

10 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this
11 Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person
12 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
13 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
14 States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the pur-
15 poses hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie
16 evidence that the person making the affidavit does not
17 advocate, and is not a member of an organization that
18 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
19 States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such
20 administrative or supervisory employees of the Department
21 as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary
22 are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons
23 making affidavits required by this section, and they shall
24 charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any
25 person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization

1 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
2 United States by force or violence and accepts employment
3 the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropria-
4 tion contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,
5 upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or
6 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
7 *further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition
8 to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of exist-
9 ing law: *Provided further,* That nothing in this section
10 shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person
11 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency
12 work involving the loss of human life or destruction of
13 property, and payment of salary or wages may be made
14 to such persons from applicable appropriations for services
15 rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit
16 contemplated by this section.

17 This Act may be cited as the "Department of Agricul-
18 ture Appropriation Act, 1945".

INDEX

	Page
Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Bureau of	41
Agricultural Economics, Bureau of	10
Agricultural Research Administration	16
Animal Industry, Bureau of	20
Beltsville Research Center	44
Commodity Credit Corporation	59
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	61
Dairy Industry, Bureau of	26
Emergency rubber project	56
Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Bureau of	33
Experiment Stations, Office of	17
Extension Service	15
Farm Credit Administration	78
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans	81
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	82
Farm tenancy	75
Federal crop insurance	65
Foreign Agricultural Relations	14
Forest roads and trails	56
Forest Service	45
General provisions	83
Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Bureau of	43
Information, Office of	5
International Production Control Committees	14
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	69
Library	9
Marketing service	69
Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, Bureau of	27
Printing and binding	7
Rural Electrification Administration	77
Secretary of Agriculture, Office of	2
Soil Conservation Service	66
Solicitor, Office of	4
Special research fund, Department of Agriculture	16
Submarginal land, retirement of	69
Sugar Act	69
War Food Administration	57
White pine blister rust	44

[FULL COMMITTEE PRINT]

Union Calendar No.

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R.

[Report No.]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TARVER

MARCH 21, 1944

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

78TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1271

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1945

MARCH 21.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4443]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1945. The estimates on which this bill are based were submitted by the President in the Budget and will be found in detail on pages 207 to 358 inclusive, and 700–701, inclusive, of that document. Subsequent to the submission of the Budget, a supplemental estimate (H. Doc. No. 478) was transmitted in the sum of $40,000.

Bill total.—The total of all items carried in the bill is $567,995,779 or $403,988,980 less than the 1944 amount and $93,520,737 less than the Budget proposals for 1945.

Direct appropriations.—The Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944 and the Budget for 1945 consists of direct appropriations, reappropriations, and transfers from permanent appropriations carried in the permanent statutes. The bill reported has disallowed the Budget proposal for the making of transfers from a permanent appropriation to items in the regular bill and is made up therefore only of the direct appropriations and reappropriations. The bill carries $535,244,192 of direct appropriations in which $40,000,000 has been included to take the place of $40,000,000 proposed by the Budget to be provided by a transfer from a permanent appropriation. The total of direct appropriations just given is $355,092,681 less than the direct appropriations carried in the Appropriation Act for 1944 and is $2,497,281 less than the Budget estimate.

Transfers from permanent appropriations.—In the bill as reported, the committee has rejected in its entirety the Budget proposal to transfer $90,000,000 from the permanent appropriation generally referred to as the Thirty Percent Fund. The Budget proposal to

transfer $40,000,000 from that fund to the item in the regular annual bill for farm program payments in supplementation of the proposed direct appropriation of $250,000,000 for such program payments has been disapproved and the committee has instead increased the amount of the direct appropriation to $290,000,000. The proposed Budget transfer of $50,000,000 from the Thirty Percent Fund to the regular bill for a school-lunch program has also been rejected and no amount for the lunch program is included in the bill.

Reappropriations.—The total of the reappropriations carried in the bill is $32,751,587, which is $1,103,701 more than the 1944 appropriations and $1,023,056 less than the Budget estimates for 1945.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

There is also available to the Department for the fiscal year 1945 from permanent appropriations not carried in this bill, $125,309,615. Certain amounts of the permanent appropriations for 1944 were transferred to and made available for expenditure for certain activities carried in the regular annual appropriation act and are proposed for such transfer in the Budget estimates for 1945. These transfers were $50,000,000 in the 1944 appropriation act and $90,000,000 in the Budget estimates for 1945, leaving $55,324,649 for the fiscal year 1944, and $35,309,615 under the Budget proposals for 1945 for comparison with the amount of $125,309,615 left available by the committee for expenditure in 1945, through its refusal to authorize such transfers. The action of the committee contemplates a total amount of permanent appropriations available in 1945 for expenditure for the purposes named in the permanent appropriation acts, which is $69,984,966 above the amount so available for 1944 and $90,000,000 above such amount under the Budget estimates for 1945.

LOANS FROM RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION FUNDS

In addition to the foregoing, the bill authorizes advances from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of $15,000,000 for farm-tenant loans. This sum is in the amount of the Budget estimate but is $15,000,000 less than the 1944 appropriations for this purpose. The 1944 Appropriation Act also carried an authorization from the same funds in the total sum of $67,500,000 for rural rehabilitation loans under the Farm Security Administration. The Budget estimate for 1945 proposes an authorization in the sum of $97,500,000. The bill reported to the House, having eliminated the Farm Security Administration in its entirety, contains no authorization of this kind for this purpose.

AUTHORIZATIONS FROM CORPORATION FUNDS

The bill also contains authorizations from corporation funds for administrative expenses of such corporations in the total sum of $13,658,526, of which $5,458,526 is for the Commodity Credit Corporation and $8,200,000 for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. The total of these authorizations is $680,819 in excess of authorizations for like purposes in 1944 and is $302,000 below the Budget estimates.

TRUST FUNDS

In addition to all of the foregoing, there comes into the custody of the Department each year substantial amounts known as trust funds. These moneys belong to various individuals or organizations and are not Government funds in any sense of the word other than that of Government custodianship. Payments from such trust funds for the benefit of the respective owners for the fiscal year 1945 are estimated in the total sum of $10,144,950, which is $2,170,200 less than such disbursements for the current fiscal year.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

In the following tables is set forth the information discussed in the foregoing text:

	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations, 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Direct appropriations	$890,336,873	$537,741,473	$535,244,192	−$355,092,681	−$2,497,281
Transfers from permanent appropriation	[1] 50,000,000	[2] 90,000,000	([2])	−50,000,000	−90,000,000
Reappropriations	31,647,886	33,775,043	32,751,587	+1,103,701	−1,023,456
Total of items in the bill	971,984,759	661,516,516	567,995,779	−403,988,980	−93,520,737
Permanent appropriations (not carried in the bill but available under permanent law)	105,324,649	125,309,615	125,309,615	+19,984,966	
Deduct transfers to items in the regular annual bill (above)	−50,000,000	−90,000,000		+50,000,000	+90,000,000
Net, permanent appropriations	55,324,649	35,309,615	125,309,615	+69,984,966	+90,000,000
Total	1,027,309,408	696,826,131	693,305,394	−334,004,014	−3,520,737

[1] Authorized to be transferred from the permanent appropriation "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities" for the school-lunch program.

[2] Budget estimates include language authorizing the transfer of $90,000,000 from the permanent appropriation "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities," $50,000,000 of which was to be used for the school-lunch program and $40,000,000 to be used for the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program. The bill eliminates the school-lunch program and provides additional direct appropriation in lieu of the Budget proposed transfer.

Loans from Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds, authorizations from corporation funds, and trust funds

	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan funds:					
Rural rehabilitation loans	$67,500,000	$97,500,000		−$67,500,000	−$97,500,000
Farm tenant loans	30,000,000	15,000,000	$15,000,000	−15,000,000	
Total loans	97,500,000	112,500,000	15,000,000	−82,500,000	−97,500,000
Authorizations from corporation funds:					
Commodity Credit Corporation	5,155,707	5,760,526	5,458,526	+302,819	−302,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	7,822,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	+378,000	
Total authorizations	12,977,707	13,960,526	13,658,526	+680,819	−302,000
Trust funds	12,315,150	10,144,950	10,144,950	−2,170,200	

SALARIES OF BUREAU CHIEFS

The appropriation act for the current fiscal year provides salaries in excess of the Classification Act schedules for the heads of three of the bureaus, as follows: Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, $10,000; Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration, $9,200; and Administrator of the War Food Administration, $10,000.

In view of the refusal of the House, in connection with the Pace bill, authorizing certain activities and appropriations for the Department, to include the provision fixing the salaries of the officials named at $10,000 per annum each, the committee has eliminated the provision from the bill as reported so that these officers will now be compensated under the provisions of the Classification Act.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The Budget estimate for the Office of the Secretary is in the sum of $1,729,200. The bill includes $1,700,000. This relatively small cut of $29,200 under the Budget can, the committee believes, be absorbed without difficulty in view of the fact that the bill carries a substantial appropriation for the Office of the War Food Administrator, under whose immediate office has been placed, on a basis of importance and authority co-equal with the Secretary, the administration of a very large part of the functions of the Department of Agriculture. The committee believes the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture has thereby been afforded relief to a substantial degree in its administrative work load.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The Budget estimate of $1,955,832 has been reduced in the sum of $125,200, leaving $1,830,632 carried in the bill for this office. Substantial reductions in other portions of the bill should be reflected in corresponding reductions in the work of the office of the Solicitor. The Budget estimates for the revival and continuation of the Federal crop-insurance program, as well as those for the continuance of the rehabilitation work under the Farm Security Administration having been omitted from the bill, a very substantial burden will, of course, be removed from the office of the Solicitor.

YEARBOOK OF AGRICULTURE—KEEPING LIVESTOCK HEALTHY

Last year the bill included an appropriation of $178,000 for printing and binding 231,250 copies of the remainder of the quotas for the Senate and House of Representatives of this valuable publication. The committee is advised that the Government Printing Office was unable to undertake the printing of this book because of other work and that responses to the first advertisement for bids on this job did not result in any bid within the amount appropriated. The job has recently been readvertised and the committee is informed by the Public Printer that one of the bids is within the amount appropriated and that the printer is taking immediate steps toward having the book printed. When the committee recommended this appropriation a year ago, it was in the belief that its publication would constitute an important contribution to the war effort. It is one of the most valu-

able of all publications ever emanating from the Department of Agriculture. It was first published many years ago under the titles "Diseases of Cattle" and "Diseases of Horses." The early editions of this book are to be found to this day in the homes of many farmers throughout the country who were fortunate enough to receive them. In recent years the demand for the re-publication of these books began to grow in volume, and as a result, a revised and up-to-date version of the original was published as the 1942 Year Book of Agriculture, under the title "Keeping Livestock Healthy." At that time only one-half of the quotas for the Senate and House of Representatives was printed, which was wholly insufficient to meet the demands on the part of the farmers, the result being that only part of the farm population of the country has the advantage of this publication. It was with the view of more fully supplying the need of the farmers, particularly during the present war emergency, for a reliable source of information on how to meet the problems arising in connection with the production of food animals that the committee recommended the printing of the remainder of the congressional quotas in last year's bill. The committee's recommendations in this matter were ratified by the subsequent action of the House and Senate in the passage of the bill.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

The committee has reduced the Budget estimate for economic investigations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from $2,475,236 to $2,325,236, or a cut of $150,000. The committee believes that this office can well stand this small reduction. Some of the activities of this Bureau seem designed to create a much more favorable impression than might be justified of benefits accruing to agriculture and to the country from the agricultural program. The committee believes our farm population and the country at large can be left to judge for themselves the value of the agricultural program, and that the efforts of this Bureau in that direction might better be applied toward the discovery of improvements in agriculture.

EXTENSION SERVICE AND OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

The appropriations for payments to States and Territories in connection with Extension Service and State agricultural experiment stations, has become more or less routine, since the laws definitely indicate the amounts authorized to be paid to the States for these purposes and appropriations are made year after year in accordance with the statutory authorizations. There is one respect, however, in which the Congress in recent years has departed somewhat from the provisions of law, and that is with respect to appropriations for payments to those States who would suffer a reduction in such payments on account of the shift in population as shown by the 1940 census. Additional appropriations have been made each year in the sum of $255,000 for the Extension Service and $63,708 under the Office of Experiment Stations to prevent the reduction of allotments to the States affected below what they had been receiving prior to the publication of the 1940 census. These items of increase above the statutory authorizations have not heretofore been reported out by the committee, but have been inserted in the bill by way of amendment

either in the House or in the Senate. This year, the committee, in recognition of the policy established by the action of Congress year after year, has included the amounts referred to in the bill as reported to the House.

RECLASSIFICATION OF VETERINARIANS

The Budget estimates for the several items under the Bureau of Animal Industry include a total increase of $996,821 to enable the Department to reclassify the positions of veterinarians, including all meat inspectors, in the field service. The Bureau contends that the importance of the work performed by this group justifies a substantially higher grade rating than is assigned to these positions at present. The committee, however, is informed that the responsibilities of the work assigned to the various classification grades in this service are the same today as they have been for many, many years. It is felt that the reclassification requested, if granted, would do no more than give the employees in this service a further increase in compensation over and above that provided by the War Overtime Pay Act and would be favorably discriminatory with respect to these employees as compared with the entire body of those in the Federal service. The committee has, therefore, reduced the several appropriations by the amounts included in the Budget to take care of these reclassifications or a total reduction as indicated of $996,821.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

Forest pathology.—Some years ago a small increase was included in the appropriation for forest pathology, for the purpose of combating a disease known as the London plane disease, seriously threatening the London plane, a very valuable street-planting tree. The Budget for this year under this head includes a reduction of $4,650, representing the complete elimination of the work on this disease. The Department reports that this research has attained its objective and has been closed out. It has become more or less axiomatic that once a research is begun by the Government it is never completed, and the committee believes that the completion of the research on this particular project deserves notice.

Potato-breeding investigations.—The committee has included $3,110 above the Budget estimate of $1,455,767 for fruit and vegetable crops and diseases. This slight increase is intended for work in connection with potato breeding.

Soil survey.—The Budget estimate of $174,582 for soil survey includes an amount of $12,000 planned for use in connection with the completion of certain county surveys. The committee has reduced the amount of the Budget estimate in the sum of $12,000, with a view of eliminating the county surveys referred to, since it is not believed they can be printed at the present time.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Forest insects.—Subsequent to the submission of the regular Budget and the opening of the hearings on this bill, the Budget Bureau submitted a supplemental estimate for 1945 in the sum of $40,000 for the

purpose of meeting the threat of an infestation in the spruce forests of the States bordering on Canada, of the spruce budworm. This pest has inflicted considerable damage upon the forest trees in former years, and there exists in Canada at this time a number of areas where widespread damage has already occurred. It is for the purpose of combating the threat of invasion by this insect of the forests of the northern tier of States that the Budget estimate of $40,000 was submitted. Pursuant to the Budget recommendations, the Committee has increased the appropriation for forest insects by $30,000 for this purpose, the remaining $10,000 of the estimate being allocated for work to be performed by the Forest Service under the appropriation for forest management.

Bee culture.—The Budget has proposed a decrease of $6,950 in the appropriation for bee culture. This decrease contemplates the discontinuance of cooperative work on bee-disease resistance and a reduction in the bee stock testing work. The committee is impressed with the great importance of the honeybee, entirely aside from the production of honey, in the pollination of fruit tree blooms, which has a very vital effect upon the quantity and quality of orchard production. The committee has therefore restored the full amount of this Budget reduction.

Dutch elm disease eradication.—The committee has provided the Budget estimate of $300,000 for Dutch elm disease eradication. Last year the committee included for the first time a proviso that the money should not be spent in any State whose laws do not require the owners of land on which infected elm trees are found to remove and destroy the same without expense to the Federal Government. It was reported to the committee this year that certain States regard the provision as offensive in that it, in effect, dictates to them the manner in which these trees must be removed without expense to the Federal Government and would preclude, for example, the removal of the trees at the expense of the State government or by any means other than removal at the expense of the owners which would not involve any expense on the part of the Federal Government.

To meet this objection, which the committee believed had a certain validity, the provisos in connection with this appropriation have been revised so as to provide (1) that no part of the appropriation may be expended for the removal or destruction of infected trees from non-Federal lands, (2) that no part of the money could be expended in any State for applying control where the Secretary finds that the removal of such trees from non-Federal lands is essential to the success of the control program unless measures deemed appropriate by the Secretary are in force for the removal and destruction of such trees from non-Federal lands at no expense to the Government, except that where such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, or on property included within local experimental control areas, funds for the removal and destruction of such trees may be expended in the discretion of the Secretary, (3) that the Secretary, may, in his discretion, require contributions, at least equal to the expenditures by the Federal Government, by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations concerned, and (4) that expenditures incurred for the removal of the trees from non-Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such contributions.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Winter Haven laboratory.—The committee has included an increase above the Budget of $18,536 for the purpose of bringing the work of citrus and citrus byproducts production now being carried on in the Winter Haven, Fla., laboratory to the total amount of $40,000. Evidence submitted to the committee indicated that extremely important work, helpful to the war effort, is being done in this particular field and believes that the increase granted is fully justified.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

The committee has included the Budget increase of $88,032 for this Bureau to determine how best to process different kinds of food at home and prevent undue loss of vitamins and other nutrients in cooking and preserving food. The committee believes that this Bureau is making a very outstanding contribution to the war effort and that its activities could be materially enlarged in this direction. This Bureau has the complete confidence and backing of a very large number of organizations, particularly women's organizations interested in the solution of the many home problems that have arisen or become more acute by reason of the national emergency. A large number of these organizations appeared before the committee and strongly urged increases over the Budget totaling $675,000. The committee believes, therefore, that its action in increasing this item in the sum of $200,000 is well justified.

FOREST SERVICE

Forest management.—The bill includes an increase of $10,000 for forest management, being a part of the supplemental Budget estimate of $40,000 for combating the spruce budworm. The remaining $30,000 of this estimate has been included in the appropriation for forest insects, discussed above under the caption "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine." The committee has included a further increase, not requested by the Budget, of $35,000 for the chemical stimulation of trees in connection with naval stores production. This increase is to enable the Bureau to expand the very promising experimental work in the application of chemicals to augment the flow of sap from turpentine woods. The results so far achieved are the result of such limited laboratory type of experiment as not to justify the recommendation of practices to the industry generally. With this increased appropriation it is hoped soon to bring the experimental work to the stage where it may be applied commercially.

Forest products.—The Budget estimate of $1,077,519 has been increased by the committee in the sum of $15,000 for studies on the part of the southern forest and range experiment station at New Orleans, in the utilization of southern hardwoods. These studies give promise of very useful results in the development of additional forest products useful in the current national emergency.

Forest economics—The committee has reduced the Budget estimate of $85,404 in the sum of $11,386. This represents the work initiated a few years ago under the Alleghany Forest Experiment Station with a view to meeting a serious unemployment problem. In view of the

disappearance of this problem generally, the committee has eliminated the item.

Forest-fire cooperation—The Budget estimate for forest-fire cooperation is in the sum of $5,000,000. This activity exists under the authority of the so-called Clarke-McNary Act but is limited by said act to $2,500,000. The committee has, therefore, reduced the Budget estimate to the amount authorized by the act, but has included an additional amount of $29,602 for overtime pay authorized by the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943.

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

The Budget has submitted an estimate for a reappropriation of $5,420,000 for the emergency rubber project. Extended hearings by the subcommittee in charge of the regular annual bill as well as by the deficiency subcommittee indicate very conclusively that this project will not achieve results in time to be of material advantage to the war effort. The committee believes that any work in this field with a view to future advantage should not be prosecuted until after the conclusion of the present emergency. The committee has, therefore, provided a reappropriation of $3,952,585 and has included language earmarking the money to cover the cost of progressive and final liquidation of the entire project during the fiscal year 1945. The committee is advised that the sum granted will enable the Department to recover an additional 325 long tons of natural rubber for an additional expenditure, during liquidation, of $265,000, or at a cost of about $0.36 per pound over the cost represented by expenditures already made.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

The Budget has submitted an estimate of $30,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the War Food Administration, an increase of $5,000,000 over the amount appropriated for the current year. The committee has allowed the Budget estimate with the exception of $800,000, which was earmarked by the Budget for wage stabilization under the Office of Labor. The committee has also included a provision prohibiting the use of the funds for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products for the administration of such orders.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The bill includes an authorization from corporate funds of $5,458,526 for administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This amount is $302,819 above the authorization for the current year and is $302,000 below the Budget estimate for 1945.

The bill as reported continues the same prohibitions against the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as were contained in last year's bill as finally enacted.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY PROGRAM PAYMENTS

The appropriation act for the current fiscal year contains a provision limiting the program for the crop year 1944 to $300,000,000, and also

limiting the program to soil-building and soil-and-water conservation practices. The Budget estimate is for a direct appropriation of $250,000,000 together with not to exceed $40,000,000 of the permanent appropriation known as the thirty-percent fund, being 30 percent of the customs receipts for the last preceding calendar year. Since this $40,000,000 is already appropriated by permanent law for an entirely different purpose, the committee did not feel it was authorized to propose in this bill that it should be diverted from the purpose for which appropriated and applied to the appropriation for the agricultural program. Consequently, the committee has recommended a direct appropriation of $290,000,000, which, with an available carryover of $10,000,000, will complete the sum of $300,000,000 authorized for the program. Last year the bill authorized $30,000,000 of the total appropriation to be expended for administrative expenses; the current budget provides $25,000,000, and the committee has further cut this amount in the sum of $750,000. Under this reduction departmental services are to be cut $500,000 and the field services $250,000.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The Budget includes an estimate of $5,997,433 for the administration of the Federal Crop Insurance Act. The Budget estimate contemplates the resumption of Federal crop insurance for the crop year 1945. However, the committee, after extended hearings which failed to disclose any reason why the Congress should reverse the position taken last year, when it voted to liquidate this activity, has disapproved the Budget estimate for renewal of the program and has provided a reappropriation of not to exceed $100,000 to complete liquidation in 1945.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Soil-conservation research.—The Budget estimate of $1,225,000 for soil-conservation research represents a reduction below the 1944 appropriation of $27,709. This reduction, involving certain incidental items, has been approved by the committee.

Soil-conservation operations.—The Budget estimate for soil-conservation operations in the sum of $31,275,000 represents an increase over 1944 of $8,477,820. The committee has reduced the Budget figure by $2,935,000. This reduction is accomplished as follows: Under the Budget proposal there was an allotment of $483,598 for operations in demonstration projects on individual farms. This entire project is eliminated under the bill as reported, $35,000 being deducted from the total sum appropriated and the remaining balance of $448,598 is to be transferred to the project for operations in conservation districts organized under State laws. From the latter project the committee has eliminated $1,951,272 for 246 special drainage and irrigation jobs and has also eliminated $508,728 for heavy equipment for special drainage and irrigation jobs. The net result of the committee's action will provide a total of $25,656,579 for operations in State conservation districts. Under the project for cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, the committee has eliminated the item of $349,008 in connection with 44 special drainage and irrigation jobs, and the item of $90,992 for heavy equipment for special drainage and irrigation jobs. This will leave a balance of $1,330,304 for this project and

will leave a total sum for soil conservation operations of every kind of $28,340,000 which is $5,542,820 in excess of the amount provided in the current appropriation act.

MARKETING SERVICE

Market news service.—Last year the Budget proposed the closing of the offices for market news on fruits and vegetables at Cleveland, Ohio; Detroit, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and this proposal was enacted into law. This year very strong and convincing representations were made to the committee of the great importance of the continuance of this work at the places named. The market news service at these points relates to a very large volume of shipments of both fruit and vegetables and the committee was impressed with the importance of these shipments with relation to the war-food program, and has therefore included an increase above the Budget of $25,915 for the purpose of restoring the service at these offices to the same level at which they were operating during the fiscal year 1943.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Budget includes an estimate of $28,500,000 of direct appropriation for administration and an authorization of $97,500,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for loans for the appropriation heretofore carried for "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation." This activity is not authorized by law and since there is now pending in the House a bill for the reorganization of the functions of the Federal Security Administration, the committee does not deem it appropriate to include in this bill any appropriation for this agency and has, therefore, eliminated the item.

FARM TENANCY

The Budget estimate includes $1,500,000 for administrative expenses under the Farm Tenant Act and proposes an authorization of $15,000,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for loans. The amount recommended for loans represents a reduction of one-half of the amount available for 1944 and the Budget estimate in this connection has been approved by the committee. With respect to the amount for salaries and expenses the committee has been governed by section 6 of the Farm Tenant Act which provides that:

> Not more than 5 per centum of the sum appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out sections 1 to 6 of this act.

Pursuant to this statutory provision, the committee has reduced the Budget estimate for salaries and expenses from $1,500,000 to $750,000. It is possible this amount will not be sufficient to administer the loans authorized in the accompanying bill and to service the outstanding loans which have been made in previous years under appropriations in sums ranging from $30,000,000 to as high as $50,000,000. The situation of the moment discloses what appears to be a defect in the law and the committee believes that the proper legislative committee of the House should direct its attention to the question of revising the law to fit the possible fluctuations in the requirements for appropriations for administrative expenses.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Budget has estimated $2,550,000 for administrative expenses and $20,000,000 for loans for the Rural Electrification Administration, and the committee has approved these Budget estimates. The loan fund of this organization has diminished very substantially since the beginning of the war emergency. Prior to that time they ran as high as $100,000,000 and in the fiscal year 1939 reached a peak of $140,000,000. The incidence of the war preempted for military purposes the entire available supply of copper, since when only such construction or extensions as would make a definite contribution to the war effort were approved. Recently, supplies of aluminum have become available in greater quantities for nonmilitary uses and this has eased the situation very materially in the field covered by the Rural Electrification Administration, since it has been found that aluminum and steel can be satisfactorily substituted for copper in many phases of this program. The sum provided for loans, namely, $20,000,000, is in the same amount as was provided last year. However, there has been a substantial accumulation of unexpended funds of former appropriations and it is believed that the additional $20,000,000 provided for the fiscal year 1945 will be ample to meet all of the demands arising under a program which is still more or less limited by military factors.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The Budget included an estimate of $50,000,000 for the continuance of the school-lunch program in the same amount as was provided for that program in 1944. As in 1944, the Budget proposed the money be taken from the so-called Thirty Percent Fund, provided under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. Since this program is not authorized by law, the committee has excluded from the bill any appropriation therefor.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The bill carries the Budget estimate of $626,321 for salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Administration, which sum will be augmented by the proceeds of assessments against the several credit institutions supervised and otherwise serviced by the Farm Credit Administration, together with $4,459,480 transferred from the funds available for crop production and harvesting loans, making in all for administrative expenses, $8,336,755.

Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans.—The bill provides reappropriations and makes available collections, the estimated total of which is $28,355,043, of which $4,459,480 is to be transferred to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses," leaving a net available of $23,895,563, for estimated obligations of $23,000,000.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.—The bill includes an authorization of $8,200,000 (the Budget estimate) for administrative expenses, which sum is $378,000 above the amount authorized for 1944. This increased amount is due to the enactment of Public, 91, approved June 26, 1943, extending from July 1, 1943 to July 1, 1945 the authority to make land bank commissioner loans. A supplemental appropriation for 1944 in a similar amount is contemplated, for the same reason.

Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases

NOTE.—Increases and decreases relating solely to changes in requirements for payment of overtime compensation are not shown]

Item	Budget increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with 1944 appropriation and estimated supplemental for overtime	Recommendation of committee
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY		
Salaries and expenses: Decrease in direct appropriation	−$8,838	Decrease approved and further decrease of $29,200 applied.
WORKING CAPITAL FUND		
Operating fund established in the 1944 Appropriation Act for economical operation of centralized reimbursable services.	−400,000	Decrease approved.
OFFICE OF SOLICITOR		
Salaries and expenses		Decrease of $125,200 provided.
OFFICE OF INFORMATION		
Salaries and expenses: Decrease in direct appropriation	−6,524	Decrease approved.
Printing and binding	−100,000	Do.
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS		
Economic investigations		Decrease of $150,000 below the Budget provided.
Crop and livestock estimates: Curtailment of current estimates and periodic reports on important war crops.	−71,720	Decrease approved.
EXTENSION SERVICE		
Additional extension work	−255,000	Decrease restored.
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION		
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR		
Salaries and expenses	+17,885	Approved.
OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS		
Bankhead-Jones Act (title 1): Discontinuance of funds provided to prevent reduction of State allotments due to farm population shifts.	−63,708	Decrease restored.
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY		
Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease:		
For proposed reclassifications of veterinarians and lay assistants.	+192,877	Disapproved.
Decrease in number of animals tested due to manpower shortage.	−165,686	Decrease approved.
Hog-cholera control:		
For proposed reclassifications of veterinarians and lay assistants.	+1,152	Disapproved.
Curtailment of expenses in States where this service is available to swine industry.	−1,000	Decrease approved.
Inspection and quarantine:		
For proposed reclassification of veterinarians and lay assistants.	+51,877	Disapproved.
Reduced activities in eradicating cattle ticks	−62,672	Decrease approved.
Meat inspection: For proposed reclassification of veterinarians and lay assistants.	+742,058	Disapproved.
Virus Serum Toxin Act:		
For proposed reclassification of veterinarians and lay assistants.	+7,113	Do.
For additional supervision of increased production of veterinary biologies.	+7,300	Approved.

Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases—Continued

Item	Budget increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with 1944 appropriation and estimated supplemental for overtime	Recommendation of committee
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING		
Agricultural engineering investigations: Elimination of nonrecurring item for watertower fire protection system at Stoneville, Miss.	−$20,000	Decrease approved.
Cereal crops and diseases: Reduction of cereal production, breeding, disease and quality investigations	−22,960	Do.
Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: Curtailment of work on cotton investigations	−10,438	Do.
Dry-land agriculture: Discontinuance of field station at Lawton, Okla., and of cooperative work at State branch stations, Moro, Oreg.	−12,563	Do.
Forest pathology: Curtailment of work on Dutch-elm disease and elimination of work on London plane disease.	−9,465	Do.
Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases	−48,661	Decrease approved, but increase of $3,110 granted for potato breeding.
Irrigation agriculture: Curtailment of work on effect of boron on crop plants and discontinuance of work on application of irrigation water for maximum production of citrus fruits and dates.	−6,800	Decrease approved.
National Arboretum: Reduction in labor costs and purchases of materials and supplies (reduced to maintenance basis).	−11,400	Do.
Plant exploration, introduction and surveys:		
Crop plant introduction and testing	−26,351	Do.
Identification and classification of economic and plant-disease fungi.	−5,029	Do.
Soil and fertilizer investigations: Completion of work on chemical stabilization of soils for military operations, and suspension of work on thermal properties of soils.	−7,239	Do.
Soil survey: Investigation, classification, and mapping of soils in the field.		Decrease of $12,000 for county surveys recommended.
Sugar-plant investigations:		
Sugar-plant production, breeding, disease, and quality investigations:		
Sugar beets	−14,590	Decrease approved.
Sugarcane	−10,950	Do.
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE		
Japanese beetle control: Curtailment of control program by reducing supplies, trapping operations and inspections.	−17,120	Do.
Citrus canker eradication: Elimination of entire item	−11,300	Do.
Dutch elm disease eradication: Reduction due to revision of work program.	−90,030	Do.
Forest insects: Investigations of insects attacking plantations and second-growth timber and development of control methods.	+30,000	Approved, for application to spruce budworm investigations.
Bee culture: Discontinuance of cooperative work on bee disease resistance in Texas and Iowa and reduction in bee stock testing work at Madison, Wyo.	−6,950	Decrease restored.
Insects affecting man and animals: Curtailment of research work on mosquitoes and closing of station engaged in dog fly research.	−13,870	Decrease approved.
Insect-pest survey and identification	−6,550	Do.
Foreign parasites: Reduction in personnel in South America engaged in collection and study of parasites.	−2,230	Do.
Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases (new item in annual agricultural appropriation bill, previously provided for in deficiency and supplemental bills).	+2,700,000	Approved.

Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases—Continued

Item	Budget increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with 1944 appropriation and estimated supplemental for overtime	Recommendation of committee
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY		
Agricultural chemical investigations: Discontinuance of hemicellulose investigations.	−$10,000	Decrease approved, but increase of $18,536 provided for the Winter Haven (Fla.) laboratory, bringing the allocation to that station up to $40,000.
Naval stores investigations: Elimination of nonrecurring item for improvement in roads and drainage ditches at Naval Stores Station, Olustee, Fla.	−3,000	Decrease approved.
BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS		
Salaries and expenses: Increase to determine how best to process food at home and prevent undue loss of vitamins and other nutrients in cooking and preserving food.	+88,032	Approved; and further increase of $200,000 recommended.
BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER		
Increase to provide essential repair and maintenance of roads at the center.	+14,200	Approved.
FOREST SERVICE		
General administrative expenses: Reduction of personnel in Chief's office.	−26,290	Decrease approved.
National forest protection and management: To handle increased volume of timber sales on the national forests, offset by elimination of $24,000 transfer to Procurement Division.	−324,472	Approved.
Forest management: Silvicultural investigations	+10,000	Approved for spruce budworm investigations and further increase recommended of $35,000 for investigations of chemical stimulation of turpentine woods.
Forest products		Increase recommended of $15,000 above the Budget for investigations in the utilization of southern hardwoods.
Forest economics: Economic-social benefits of forestry investigations.		Decrease below Budget of $11,386 recommended.
Forest fire cooperation:		
Cooperation with States in forest fire prevention and suppression.	−1,284,610	Decreases approved and further decrease recommended of $2,470,938 in the item for cooperation with States.
Taxation inquiry and insurance	−50,307	Decrease approved.
Farm and other private forestry cooperation	−15,765	Do.
Acquisition of lands for national forests: Cessation of land acquisition program.	−41,077	Do.
FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS		
Forest road development	−323,227	Do.
Transfer to Procurement Division, Treasury Department.	−6,000	Do.
EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT		
Curtailment in operations and in some phases of research work, as follows:		
Guayule	−6,108,474	Decreases approved and further decreases imposed, providing only a reappropriation $3,952,585 for complete liquidation in 1945.
Kok-sagyz	−1,127,774	
Goldenrod	−426,752	
Cryptostegia	+35,000	

Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases—Continued

Item	Budget increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with 1944 appropriation and estimated supplemental for overtime	Recommendation of committee
WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION		
(Salaries and expenses)		
Salaries and expenses: Increase for financing war food production and distribution program on a full-year basis.	+$3,093,980	Approved, less a committee reduction of $800,000, eliminating wage stabilization work.
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION		
Administrative expenses from Corporation funds: Increase to provide for continued performance of expanded activities, and further expansion of others.	+604,819	Decrease recommended of $302,000 below Budget.
CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES		
Elimination of production adjustment payments offset in part by increases in funds for conservation practice payments.	[1] −150,000,000	Committee restored $40,000,000 of the decrease and eliminated Budget proposal for transfer of $40,000,000 from "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities."
PARITY PAYMENTS		
Elimination of parity payments on the 1943 crops	−170,281,000	Approved.
FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT		
Federal Crop Insurance Act: To reinstate the crop-insurance program.	+2,497,433	Budget proposals looking to resumption of crop insurance disallowed. Reappropriation of not to exceed $100,000 provided for completion of liquidation.
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE		
Soil-conservation research: Reduction in incidental items.	−27,709	Approved.
Soil-conservation operations:		
Soil- and water-conservation operations in demonstration projects.	----------	Allotment of $483,598 for this project eliminated, through reduction of $35,000 in the total appropriation for soil-conservation operations and the transfer of the balance ($448,598) to the project (immediately below) conservation operations to districts organized under State laws.
Soil-conservation operations in conservation districts organized under State laws.	+7,365,724	Decrease of $2,460,000 below Budget, recommended as follows: Elimination of $1,951,272 for 246 special drainage and irrigation jobs. Elimination of $508,728 for heavy equipment for special drainage and irrigation jobs.
Cooperation with other Federal and State agencies	+1,124,286	Decrease of $440,000 below Budget recommended through elimination of cooperation with other Federal and State agencies in connection with 44 special drainage and irrigation jobs; ($349,008) and elimination of heavy equipment for special drainage and irrigation jobs ($90,992).
Allotments to other agencies	−12,190	Decrease approved.

[1] The Budget estimate provides that $40,000,000 shall be available by transfer from "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities," thus providing for a working fund decrease of $110,000,000.

Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases—Continued

Item	Budget increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with 1944 appropriation and estimated supplemental for overtime	Recommendation of committee
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—continued		
Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: Curtailment of temporary personnel in research and demonstration work in soil-conservation control measures in Everglades region, Florida.	$−9,461	Decrease approved.
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land (title III, Farm Tenant Act): Acquisition of land.	−12,165	Do.
Development and management of land acquired	−46,710	Do.
OFFICE OF DISTRIBUTION		
School-lunch program		Eliminates Budget proposal to authorize use of $50,000,000 of section 32 money (30 percent of customs receipts).
Sugar Act:		
Conditional payments to sugar growers	−2,373,371	Budget approved.
Transfers to other agencies	+514	Do.
Elimination of amount required in 1944 for obligations incurred in 1943 for conditional payments to producers pursuant to Public Law 386, 77th Cong., increasing the base rate of pay from 60 to 80 cents per 100 pounds.	−9,000,000	Do.
Market news service: Market news on fruits and vegetables.		Increase of $25,915 above Budget recommended to restore service at Cleveland, Detroit, and Seattle.
Federal Seed Act: To meet wartime demands for Federal seed inspection.	+$23,950	Approved.
Insecticide Act: Establishment of fungicide testing laboratory at San Francisco, Calif.	+22,302	Do.
Freight rates for farm products: To establish item as a separate appropriation—formerly financed from "conservation and use of agricultural land resources."	+78,762	Do.
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION		
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation:		
Salaries and expenses: Reduction in grants and loan collection and servicing costs, offset in part by increase for expenses in connection with new loans, as follows:	+1,879,680	No appropriation recommended for Farm Security Administration.
Making loans, assisting and servicing original loans.		
Collecting, assisting and servicing outstanding loans.	−3,905,846	
Grants	−250,000	
Rural rehabilitation projects		
Allotments and transfers to other appropriations	−10,119	
Loans (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for making some 39,000 additional original standard loans).	+30,000,000	
Farm Tenancy (title I, Farm Tenant Act):		
Salaries and expenses: Reflects operating economies	15,446	Approved, and further decrease of $750,000 recommended.
Farm tenancy loans (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds representing a reduction of some 2,700 loans to be made in 1945).	−15,000,000	Budget recommendations approved.
Transfers to other departments	+450	
Liquidation and management of resettlement projects (title IV, Farm Tenant Act): Elimination of appropriation.	−481,752	Do.
Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas: Elimination of appropriation.	−1,029,738	Do.
Flood restoration loans: Elimination of emergency loans for restoring 1943 flood damage.	−15,000,000	Do.

Committee's action on Budget increases and decreases—Continued

Item	Budget increase (+) or decrease (−) compared with 1944 appropriation and estimated supplemental for overtime	Recommendation of committee
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION		
Salaries and expenses:		
Lending activities	+$4,867	Budget approved.
Construction assistance and appraised activities	−17,092	
Supervision of general operation of cooperatives	+9,225	
General administrative activities	−5,000	
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION		
Salaries and expenses:		
Direct appropriation	−62,938	Do.
Transfer from farmers' crop production and harvesting loans.	−52,535	
Amounts chargeable against activities administered by Farm Credit Administration.	−138,505	
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans:		
Direct appropriation (eliminate amount provided in 1944 act to replenish funds available for loans).	−4,907,273	Approved.
Reappropriation	−2,031,288	Do.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (administrative expenses from Corporation funds, to provide for continuation of making of land bank commissioner loans pursuant to Public 91, 78th Cong.).	+378,000	Do.

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in the bill are recommended:

On page 13, under the appropriation for crop and livestock estimates:

: Provided, however, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations:

On page 58 under the War Food Administration:

actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, of persons serving while away from their permanent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by the War Food Administration, without other compensation from the United States, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $200,000; Provided, That the applicable appropriations available to the War Food Administration, current at the time services are rendered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or estimated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration, incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products for administration of such orders: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization.

On pages 62 to 65, inclusive, under the appropriation for "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources"; the following:

including the value of seeds, fertilizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants under the 1945 program; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State Committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States:

Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or contributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in activities designed to influence the action of Congress with respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except that employees may furnish to Congress any information authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by Congress, or by any of its committees or members).

On page 68, under "Soil conservation operations":

Provided, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects:

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1945

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945

[NOTE.—Items in brackets are not extended into the totals. The figures shown in the column "Appropriations, 1944," are adjusted to include amounts set up in the Budget for overtime]

Item	Appropriations, 1944 [1]	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$1, 738, 038	$1, 729, 200	$1, 700, 000	−$38, 038	−$29, 200
Working capital fund	400, 000			−400, 000	
Office of Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	1, 964, 205	1, 955, 832	1, 830, 632	−133, 573	−125, 200
Office of Information:					
Salaries and expenses	512, 524	506, 000	506, 000	−6, 524	
Printing and binding	1, 200, 000	1, 100, 000	1, 100, 000	−100, 000	
Reproduction of 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture	178, 000			−178, 000	
Total	1, 890, 524	1, 606, 000	1, 606, 000	−284, 524	
Library: Salaries and expenses	543, 233	543, 233	543, 233		
Bureau of Agricultural Economics:					
Economic investigations	2, 475, 236	2, 475, 236	2, 325, 236	−150, 000	−150, 000
Crop and livestock estimates	1, 571, 720	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	−71, 720	
Total	4, 046, 956	3, 975, 236	3, 825, 236	−221, 720	−150, 000

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations: Salaries and expenses	481, 505	481, 505	481, 505		
Extension Service:					
Payments to States and Territories	14, 198, 950	13, 943, 950	14, 198, 950		+255, 000
Salaries and expenses: Administration and coordination of extension work	748, 843	748, 843	748, 843		
Total	[2] 14, 947, 793	[2] 14, 692, 793	[2] 14, 947, 793		+255, 000
Agricultural Research Administration:					
Office of Administrator: Salaries and expenses	118, 771	136, 656	136, 656	+17, 885	
Special research fund	1, 225, 546	1, 226, 364	1, 226, 364	+818	
Office of Experiment Stations:					
Payment to States and Territories	7, 001, 208	6, 937. 500	7, 001, 208		+63, 708
Salaries and expenses:					
Administration and coordination of research with States	176, 169	176, 169	176, 169		
Federal experiment station, Puerto Rico	107, 074	107, 074	107, 074		
Total, salaries and expenses	283, 243	283. 243	283, 243		
Total	7, 284, 451	7, 220, 743	7, 284, 451		+63, 708

[1] Including estimated amounts set up in the Budget schedules for overtime pay.
[2] In addition, permanent annual appropriation, $4,704,710.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945—Continued

[NOTE.—Items in brackets are not extended into the totals. The figures shown in the column "Appropriations, 1944," are adjusted to include amounts set up in the Budget for overtime]

Item	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Agricultural Research Administration—Continued.					
Bureau of Animal Industry (salaries and expenses):					
General administrative expenses	$195, 379	$195, 379	$195, 379		
Animal husbandry	899, 500	899, 500	899, 500		
Diseases of animals	756, 939	756, 939	756, 939		
Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease	5, 983, 800	5, 777, 191	[2a] 5, 240, 355	−$743, 445	−$536, 836
Hog-cholera control	115, 288	115, 440	114, 288	−1, 000	−1, 152
Inspection and quarantine	1, 013, 925	1, 003, 130	951, 253	−62, 672	−51, 877
Meat inspection	8, 617, 066	9, 359, 124	8, 616, 759	−307	−742, 365
Virus Serum Toxin Act	264, 815	279, 228	272, 115	+7, 300	−7, 113
Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus and serum [3]					
Total	17, 846, 712	18, 385, 931	17, 046, 588	−800, 124	−1, 339, 343
Bureau of Dairy Industry (salaries and expenses)	812, 958	812, 958	812, 958		

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering (salaries and expenses):					
General administrative expenses	225, 000	225, 000	225, 000		
Agricultural engineering investigations	293, 639	293, 639	293, 639		
Cereal crops and diseases	668, 556	645, 596	645, 596	−22, 960	
Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases	467, 140	456, 702	456, 702	−10, 438	
Drug and related plants	70, 191	70, 308	70, 308	+117	
Dry-land agriculture	257, 563	245, 000	245, 000	−12, 563	
Forage crops and diseases	327, 837	327, 837	327, 837		
Forest pathology	264, 765	255, 300	255, 300	−9, 465	
Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases	1, 504, 428	1, 455, 767	1, 458, 877	−45, 551	+3, 110
Irrigation agriculture	151, 800	145, 000	145, 000	−6, 800	
National Arboretum	42, 900	31, 500	31, 500	−11, 400	
Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys	321, 380	290, 000	290, 000	−31, 380	
Plant Industry Experiment Farm	56, 900	56, 976	56, 976	+76	
Soil and fertilizer investigations	354, 030	346, 791	346, 791	−7, 239	
Soil survey	174, 451	174, 582	162, 582	−11, 869	−12, 000
Sugar-plant investigations	395, 540	370, 000	370, 000	−25, 540	
Tobacco investigations	131, 020	131, 020	131, 020		
Total	5, 707, 140	5, 521, 018	5, 512, 128	−195, 012	−8, 890

[2a] And reappropriation of $343,959.
[3] Funds to carry out this activity transferred from "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration."

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945—Continued

[NOTE.—Items in brackets are not extended into the totals. The figures shown in the column "Appropriations, 1944," are adjusted to include amounts set up in the Budget for overtime]

Item	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Agricultural Research Administration—Continued.					
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:					
Salaries and expenses:					
General administrative expenses	$160, 720	$160, 920	$160, 920	+$200	
Fruit insects	456, 630	457, 230	457, 230	+600	
Japanese beetle control	417, 120	400, 000	400, 000	−17, 120	
Sweetpotato weevil control	78, 470	78, 670	78, 670	+200	
Mexican fruitfly control	168, 920	169, 820	169, 820	+900	
Citrus canker eradication	11, 300			−11, 300	
Gypsy and browntail moth control	409, 820	409, 320	409, 320	−500	
Dutch elm disease eradication	390, 030	300, 000	300, 000	−90, 030	
Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication	99, 340	99, 340	99, 340		
Forest insects	172, 000	[3a] 202, 000	202, 000	+30, 000	
Truck crop and garden insects	320, 340	320, 340	320, 340		

Truck crop and garden insects	326, 340	326, 340	326, 340	----------	----------
Cereal and forage insects	402, 870	403, 370	403, 370	+500	----------
Barberry eradication	258, 470	258, 470	258, 470	----------	----------
Cotton insects	163, 730	163, 730	163, 730	----------	----------
Pink bollworm and Thurberia control	735, 860	738, 960	738, 960	+3, 100	----------
Bee culture	91, 950	85, 000	91, 950	----------	+$6, 950
Insects affecting man and animals	188, 870	175, 000	175, 000	−13, 870	----------
Insect-pest survey and identification	151, 550	145, 000	145, 000	−6, 550	----------
Foreign parasites	22, 230	20, 000	20, 000	−2, 230	----------
Control investigations	76, 485	76, 485	76, 485	----------	----------
Insecticide and fungicide investigations	130, 520	130, 520	130, 520	----------	----------
Transit inspection	45, 900	45, 900	45, 900	----------	----------
Foreign plant quarantines	794, 900	797, 700	797, 700	+2, 800	----------
Certification of exports	34, 480	34, 480	34, 480	----------	----------
Total, salaries and expenses	5, 788, 505	5, 678, 255	5, 685, 205	−103, 300	+6, 950
Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases	([4])	2, 700, 000	2, 700, 000	+2, 700, 000	----------
Total	5, 788, 505	8, 378, 255	8, 385, 205	+2, 596, 700	+6, 950

[3a] Includes $30,000 submitted in H. Doc. 478 for surveys and investigational work on spruce budworm.
[4] Unobligated balance of $3,311,122 of a 1943 supplemental appropriation (on a control-year basis) is available for 1944.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945—Continued

[NOTE.—Items in brackets are not extended into the totals. The figures shown in the column "Appropriations, 1944," are adjusted to include amounts set up in the Budget for overtime]

Item	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Agricultural Research Administration—Continued.					
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry (salaries and expenses):					
General administrative expenses	$82, 250	$82, 250	$82, 250		
Agricultural chemical investigations	304, 875	294, 875	313, 411	+$8, 536	+$18, 536
Naval stores investigations	115, 100	112, 100	112, 100	−3, 000	
Regional research laboratories	4, 240, 040	4, 244, 600	4, 244, 600	+4, 560	
Total	4, 742, 265	4, 733, 825	4, 752, 361	+10, 096	+18, 536
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics (salaries and expenses)	516, 384	606, 630	806, 630	+290, 246	+200, 000
Beltsville Research Center	116, 560	130, 760	130, 760	+14, 200	
White pine blister rust control	2, 262, 375	2, 264, 026	2, 264, 026	+1, 651	
Forest Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
General administrative expenses	651, 290	625, 000	625, 000	−26, 290	

National forest protection and management	17, 404, 954	17, 729, 426	17, 729, 426	+324, 472	
Fighting forest fires	100, 000	100, 000	100, 000		
Forest management	453, 848	[4a] 463, 848	498, 848	+45, 000	+35, 000
Range investigations	288, 475	288, 475	288, 475		
Forest products	1, 077, 519	1, 077, 519	1, 092, 519	+15, 000	+15, 000
Forest survey	156, 246	156, 246	156, 246		
Forest economics	85, 404	85, 404	74, 018	−11, 386	−11, 386
Forest influences	86, 762	86, 762	86, 762		
Forest fire cooperation	6, 334, 917	5, 000, 000	2, 529, 062	−3, 805, 855	−2, 470, 938
Farm and other private forestry cooperation	797, 231	781, 466	781, 466	−15, 765	
Acquisition of lands for national forests	116, 077	75, 000	75, 000	−41, 077	
Total	27, 552, 723	26, 469, 146	24, 036, 822	−3, 515, 901	−2, 432, 324
Forest roads and trails	3, 249, 168	4, 161, 496	4, 161, 496	+912, 328	
Emergency rubber project	13, 048, 000	(5)	(5)	−13, 048, 000	
War Food Administration (salaries and expenses)	26, 906, 020	30, 000, 000	29, 200, 000	+2, 293, 980	−800, 000
Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses from Corporation funds	[5, 155, 707]	[5, 760, 526]	[5, 458, 526]	[+302, 819]	[−302, 000]
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	400, 000, 000	[6] 250, 000, 000	290, 000, 000	−110, 000, 000	+40, 000, 000

[4a] Includes $10,000 submitted in H. Doc. 478 for surveys and investigational work on spruce budworm.

[5] Program in 1945 to be financed by reappropriation of $5,420,000 of the unobligated balances of 1942 and 1943 appropriations. Bill requires complete liquidation in 1945 and provides for that purpose a reappropriation of not to exceed $3,952,585.

[6] In addition, the Budget estimate provides for $40,000,000 to be transferred to this appropriation item from the permanent appropriation "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities." The Budget estimate also provides $25,000,000 for administrative expenses, which the accompanying bill reduces to $24,250,000. In lieu of the Budget transfer, the bill provides additional direct appropriation of $40,000,000.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945—Continued

[NOTE.—Items in brackets are not extended into the totals. The figures shown in the column "Appropriations, 1944," are adjusted to include amounts set up in the Budget for overtime]

Item	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Parity payments	[7] $170, 281, 000			−$170,281,000	
Federal Crop Insurance Act: Administrative and operating expenses	[8] 3, 500, 000	[8] $5, 997, 433	(9)	−3, 500, 000	−$5, 997, 433
Soil Conservation Service:					
Soil conservation research	1, 252, 709	1, 225, 000	$1, 225, 000	−27, 709	
Soil conservation operations	22, 797, 180	31, 275, 000	28, 340, 000	+5, 542, 820	−2, 935, 000
Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida	81, 709	72, 248	72, 248	−9, 461	
Total	24, 131, 598	32, 572, 248	29, 637, 248	+5, 505, 650	−2, 935, 000
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land (title III, Farm Tenant Act)	1, 308, 875	1, 250, 000	1, 250, 000	−58, 875	
Office of Distribution:					
School-lunch program	[9a 50, 000, 000]	[9a 50, 000, 000]	(9a)	[−50, 000, 000]	[−50, 000, 000]
Sugar Act	63, 883, 060	52, 510, 203	52, 510, 203	−11, 372, 857	
Marketing Service:					
Market news service	1, 240, 000	1, 241, 375	1, 267, 290	+27, 290	+25, 915

Market inspection of farm products	546, 679	547, 679	547, 679	+1, 000	
Marketing farm products	450, 690	451, 500	451, 500	+810	
Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts	932, 582	933, 500	933, 500	+918	
Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency and Standard Container Acts	208, 578	210, 000	210, 000	+1, 422	
Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts	1, 210, 783	1, 210, 783	1, 210, 783		
United States Grain Standards Act	860, 999	860, 999	860, 999		
United States Warehouse Act	533, 717	533, 930	533, 930	+213	
Federal Seed Act	93, 750	117, 700	117, 700	+23, 950	
Packers and Stockyards Act	421, 212	418, 700	418, 700	−2, 512	
Naval Stores Act	34, 728	34, 728	34, 728		
Insecticide Act	192, 906	215, 208	215, 208	+22, 302	
Commodity Exchange Act	348, 581	348, 797	348, 797	+216	
Freight rates for farm products		78, 762	78, 762	+78, 762	
Total	7, 075, 205	7, 203, 661	7, 229, 576	+154, 371	+25, 915

[7] Appropriation in 1944 was to liquidate obligations incurred under the authorization therefor in the 1943 Act; the Budget does not contain an estimate for 1945, since the 1944 Act made no provision for further parity payments programs.

[8] Appropriation in 1944 not available for any expenses connected with insurance of wheat and cotton planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, except for those necessary to liquidate insurance on such crops planted prior to that date; 1945 estimate provides for reinstatement of wheat and cotton insurance effective with the 1945 crop.

[9] Reappropriation of $100,000 to complete liquidation.

[9a] Appropriation Act, 1944, and Budget estimate, 1945, provided for this item to be financed from the permanent appropriation "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities." The item is not provided for in the bill.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945—Continued

[NOTE.—Items in brackets are not extended into the totals. The figures shown in the column "Appropriations, 1944," are adjusted to include amounts set up in the Budget for overtime]

Item	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation:					
Direct appropriation	$30, 786, 285	$28, 500, 000	----------	−$30, 786, 285	−$28, 500, 000
Loans (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	[67, 500, 000]	[97, 500, 000]	----------	[−67, 500, 000]	[−97, 500, 000]
Farm tenancy (title I, Farm Tenant Act):					
Salaries and expenses	1, 514, 996	1, 500, 000	$750, 000	−764, 996	−750, 000
Loans (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	[30, 000, 000]	[15, 000, 000]	[15, 000, 000]	[−15, 000, 000]	----------
Liquidation and management of resettlement projects (title IV, Farm Tenant Act)	481, 752	(10)	(10)	−481, 752	----------
Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas	1, 029, 738	(11)	----------	−1, 029, 738	----------
Flood restoration loans	15, 000, 000	(12)	----------	−15, 000, 000	----------
Rural Electrification Administration:					
Administrative expenses	2, 558, 000	2, 550, 000	2, 550, 000	−8, 000	----------
Loans (appropriated funds)	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	----------	----------
Total	22, 558, 000	22, 550, 000	22, 550, 000	−8, 000	----------

Farm Credit Administration:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Direct appropriation	[13] 689, 259	626, 321	626, 321	−62, 938	
Transfer from farmers' crop production and harvesting loans	[4, 512, 015]	[4, 459, 480]	[4, 459, 480]	[−52, 535]	
Amounts chargeable against activities administered by Farm Credit Administration	[3, 389, 459]	[3, 250, 954]	[3, 250, 954]	[−138, 505]	
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans [14]	4, 907, 273			−4, 907, 273	
Total	5, 596, 532	626, 321	626, 321	−4, 970, 211	
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Administrative expenses from Corporation funds	[15] [7, 822, 000]	[8, 200, 000]	[8, 200, 000]	[+378, 000]	
Total, direct appropriations	890, 336, 873	537, 741, 473	535, 244, 192	−355, 092, 681	−2, 497, 281
Transfers from permanent appropriation	[16] 50, 000, 000	[17] 90, 000, 000	([17])	−50, 000, 000	−90, 000, 000

[10] Necessary liquidation and management expenses in 1945 for activities previously financed under this item will be financed from trust funds received for such purposes from such projects.

[11] Authority for servicing and making water facility loans is provided in the Budget estimate for the item "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation."

[12] Authority for the servicing and collecting of loans made during 1944 under this item is provided in the Budget estimate for the item "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation."

[13] Appropriation of $21,800,000 for 1944 made to Treasury Department for payments to Federal land banks on account of reduction in interest rate on mortgages.

[14] See also table of reappropriations.

[15] Appropriation of $7,400,000 for 1944 made to Treasury Department for payments on account of reduction in interest rate on mortgages.

[16] In addition, $50,000,000 authorized to be transferred from the permanent appropriation "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities" for the school-lunch program.

[17] In addition, Budget estimates include language authorizing the transfer of $90,000,000 from the permanent appropriation "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities," $50,000,000 of which was to be used for the school-lunch program and $40,000,000 to be used for the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program. The bill eliminates the school-lunch program and provides additional direct appropriation of $40,000,000 in lieu of the Budget transfer.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945—Continued

[NOTE.—Items in brackets are not extended into the totals. The figures shown in the column "Appropriations, 1944" are ajusted to include amounts set up in the Budget for overtime]

Item	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Reappropriations	$31, 647, 886	$33, 775, 043	$32, 751, 587	+$1, 103, 701	−$1, 023, 456
Total of items in the bill	971, 984, 759	661, 516, 516	567, 995, 779	−403, 988, 980	−93, 520, 737
PERMANENT ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS					
Extension Service	$4, 704, 710	$4, 704, 710	$4, 704, 710		
Forest Service	3, 492, 805	3, 492, 805	3, 492, 805		
Payments to counties from submarginal land program	75, 196	112, 100	112, 100	+$36, 904	
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities	97, 051, 938	117, 000, 000	117, 000, 000	+19, 948, 062	
Total, permanent appropriations	105, 324, 649	125, 309, 615	125, 309, 615	+19, 984, 966	
REAPPROPRIATIONS					
Bureau of Animal Industry			$343, 959	+$343, 959	+$343, 959
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering	$20, 000			−20, 000	

Forest roads and trails	1, 241, 555			−1, 241, 555	
Emergency rubber project		$5, 420, 000	3, 952, 585	+3, 952, 585	−1, 467, 415
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation			100, 000	+100, 000	+100, 000
Farm Credit Administration:					
Farmer's crop production and harvesting loans:					
Unobligated balances from prior years	10, 386, 331	8, 355, 043	8, 355, 043	−2, 031, 288	
Estimated collections to be available	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000		
Total, reappropriations	31, 647, 886	33, 775, 043	32, 751, 587	+1, 103, 701	−1, 023, 456
TRUST FUNDS [18]					
Cooperative work, Forest Service	$2, 000, 000	$2, 000, 000	$2, 000, 000		
Agricultural Adjustment Agency:					
Moisture content and grade determinations for Commodity Credit Corporation	1, 517, 300	1, 350, 000	1, 350, 000	−$167, 300	
Indemnity fund, county associations	350	350	350		
Undistributed cotton-price adjustment payments	1, 000	1, 000	1, 000		
Farm Security Administration:					
Payments in lieu of taxes and for operation and maintenance of resettlement projects	783, 400	250, 000	250, 000	−533, 400	
State Rural Rehabilitation Corporation funds	5, 000, 000	3, 800, 000	3, 800, 000	−1, 200, 000	

[18] Not Government funds. Moneys belonging to others, to be paid to or expended on behalf of the respective owner.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945—Continued

TRUST FUNDS—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1944	Budget estimates, 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
Farm Security Administration—Continued.					
Liquidation of deposits, lease and purchase contracts	$125, 000	$40, 000	$40, 000	−$85, 000	
Liquidation of deposits, reserve for maintenance and repair, lease and purchase agreements	4, 000	2, 500	2, 500	−1, 500	
Food Distribution Administration:					
Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products	2, 200, 000	2, 200, 000	2, 200, 000		
Grading of commodities for Commodity Credit Corporation	433, 000	250, 000	250, 000	−183, 000	
Miscellaneous contributed funds	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000		
Unearned fees and other charges, unclaimed moneys, etc	1, 100	1, 100	1, 100		
Total, trust funds	12, 315, 150	10, 144, 950	10, 144, 950	−2, 170, 200	

○

Union Calendar No. 425

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

[Report No. 1271]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 21, 1944

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1945, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Office of the Secretary

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, and other personal services in the Office of the Secretary in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of one and the maintenance, repair, and operation of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, $1,700,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $187,390, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to contract for stenographic reporting services, and the appropriations made in this Act shall be available for such purposes, and to expend from appropriations available for the purchase of lands not to exceed $1 for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land: *Provided further,* That with the approval of the Secretary, employees of the Department stationed abroad may enter into leases for official quarters, for periods not exceeding one year, and may pay rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the discharge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country where custom or practice requires payment in advance: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or

1 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
2 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
3 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
4 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to dam-
5 age threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to
6 future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided fur-*
7 *ther,* That, except to provide materials required in or incident
8 to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
9 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by
10 this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manu-
11 factured from commodities or materials produced outside of
12 the United States.

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor includ-
15 ing personal services in the District of Columbia and else-
16 where, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodi-
17 cals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries
18 by attorneys in the field service, $1,830,632, together with
19 such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as
20 are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal
21 year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or
22 portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary,
23 not exceeding a total of $340,000, shall be transferred to
24 and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be
25 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia

1 not to exceed $1,015,000: *Provided, however,* That if the
2 total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the
3 fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the
4 amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for
5 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred thereform
6 to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended
7 for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be
8 increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of
9 the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with
10 representatives of the Department, shall determine are ap-
11 propriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions
12 or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

13 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses in connection with the pub-
16 lication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins,
17 documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and
18 display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and
19 exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the
20 Department, $506,000, together with such amounts from
21 other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in
22 the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for
23 such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof,
24 as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a
25 total of $251,179, shall be transferred to and made a part

1 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts
2 not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes
3 enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District
4 of Columbia, $587,955; for preparation and display of
5 exhibits, $46,625 and the preparation, distribution, and dis-
6 play of motion and sound pictures, $59,500, including co-
7 operation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other
8 agencies: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
9 of the appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal
10 year 1945 from which transfers to this appropriation
11 are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below
12 the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget
13 for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred
14 therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which
15 may be expended for personal services in the District of
16 Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
17 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
18 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall
19 determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed
20 by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or
21 authorizations: *Provided further,* That when and to the
22 extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural
23 exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the
24 authorized programs of the various agencies of the Depart-
25 ment can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or

1 distributed by the Office of Information, as the central
2 agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not
3 exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred
4 to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds
5 applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified
6 herein, including personal services in the District of Colum-
7 bia: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion
8 pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a
9 total of $10,000 may be used for the temporary employment,
10 by contract or otherwise, of specialists, technicians, and
11 experts, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as
12 amended: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall
13 be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or
14 State field offices or for the compensation of employees in
15 such offices except that not to exceed $13,900 may be used
16 to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

17 PRINTING AND BINDING

18 For all printing and binding for the Department, in-
19 cluding all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services
20 located in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere,
21 except as otherwise in the Act provided, $1,100,000, includ-
22 ing the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
23 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of
24 the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
25 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915

1 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108),
2 and in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
3 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
4 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
5 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
6 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or
7 sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Sena-
8 tors, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they
9 shall direct, but not including work done at the field print-
10 ing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint
11 Committee on Printing, in accordance with the Act ap-
12 proved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided,*
13 That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from
14 the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agri-
15 cultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary
16 for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas
17 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from
18 funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section
19 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as
20 amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and
21 binding in connection with the activities under said section
22 32, and from funds appropriated for "Salaries and expenses,
23 War Food Administration", such sums as may be necessary
24 for printing and binding in connection with functions as-
25 signed to the Office of Information by the War Food Admin-

1 istrator: *Provided further,* That the total amount that may
2 be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding
3 proviso shall not exceed $385,000.

4 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 Salaries and expenses: For purchase and exchange of
6 reference books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books,
7 periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imper-
8 fect series; not to exceed $1,200 for newspapers; for dues,
9 when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership
10 in societies or associations which issue publications to mem-
11 bers only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers
12 who are not members; for salaries in the city of Washing-
13 ton and elsewhere; for official travel expenses, and for library
14 fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary
15 expenses, $543,233, together with such amounts from other
16 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
17 schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such
18 salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions
19 thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceed-
20 ing a total of $750, shall be transferred to and made a part
21 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation not to
22 exceed $369,070, may be expended for personal services in
23 the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That if the total
24 amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

1 year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts
2 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
3 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
4 appropriation and the amount which may be expended for
5 personal services in the District of Columbia shall be in-
6 creased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the
7 Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with repre-
8 sentatives of the Department, shall determine are appro-
9 priate to the requirements as changed by such reductions
10 or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Pro-*
11 *vided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to make
12 copies of bibliographies prepared by the Department library,
13 microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books
14 and other library materials in the Department and sell such
15 bibliographies and reproductions at such prices (not less
16 than estimated cost of furnishing same) as he may deter-
17 mine, the money received from such sales to be deposited
18 in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation.

19 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

20 For the employment of persons and means in the Dis-
21 trict of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in
22 cooperation with public agencies or organizations, including
23 not to exceed $2,150,000 for personal services in the Dis-
24 trict of Columbia, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase

1 of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as
2 follows:
3 Economic investigations: For acquiring and diffusing
4 useful information among the people of the United States, for
5 conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations,
6 and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities
7 of the Department, relative to agricultural production, dis-
8 tribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest
9 aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization
10 of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm
11 population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance
12 and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand
13 for the different farm and food products; land ownership
14 and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to
15 agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends,
16 $2,325,236, together with such amounts from other appro-
17 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
18 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and
19 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
20 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
21 $245,377 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
22 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
23 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
24 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts

1 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
2 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this ap-
3 propriation and the amount which may be expended for per-
4 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or
5 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of
6 the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
7 the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
8 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in
9 such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,*
10 That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made
11 available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be
12 used for State and county land-use planning.

13 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
14 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
15 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and
16 livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
17 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
18 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooper-
19 ation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State,
20 and local agencies, and for the collection and publication of
21 statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June
22 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
23 $1,500,000, together with such amounts from other appro-

1 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
2 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and
3 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
4 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
5 $175,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this
6 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
7 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
8 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts esti-
9 mated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
10 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
11 appropriation and the amount which may be expended for
12 personal services in the District of Columbia shall be in-
13 creased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the
14 Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with repre-
15 sentatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate
16 to the requirements as changed by such reductions or in-
17 creases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided*
18 *further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be
19 available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating,
20 or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
21 acreage to be planted in cotton: *Provided further,* That esti-
22 mates of apple production shall be confined to the commercial
23 crop.

1 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
2 RELATIONS

3 Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the functions
4 of the Secretary under the Act of June 5, 1930, as amended
5 (7 U. S. C. 541–545), independently and in cooperation
6 with other branches of the Government, State agencies, pur-
7 chasing and consuming organizations and persons engaged in
8 the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution
9 of farm and food products, and for enabling the Secretary
10 to discharge his functions as a member of the joint Great
11 Britain-United States board known as the Combined Food
12 Board, including the employment of persons and means in
13 the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase of
14 such books and periodicals and not to exceed $500 for news-
15 papers as may be necessary in connection with this work,
16 $481,505.

17 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
18 COMMITTEES

19 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
20 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
21 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
22 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
23 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
24 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
25 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-

1 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
2 thereto.

3 EXTENSION SERVICE

4 PAYMENTS TO STATES; HAWAII; ALASKA; AND PUERTO RICO

5 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
6 Puerto Rico for cooperative agricultural extension work as
7 follows:

8 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
9 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
10 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
11 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935
12 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; additional extension
13 work, the Act approved April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 589),
14 $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929
15 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-
16 Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3
17 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),
18 extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the
19 Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950;
20 Puerto Rico, the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
21 343f–343g) extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bank-
22 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $140,000; in all, Capper-
23 Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $14,198,950.

24 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

25 Administration and coordination of extension work: For

1 the employment of persons and means in the District of
2 Columbia and elsewhere to enable the Secretary to adminis-
3 ter the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8,
4 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or sup-
5 plementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work
6 of the Department and the several States, Territories, and
7 insular possessions, including cooperation with other bureaus
8 and offices of the Department, and Federal, State, county,
9 and other agencies, in the development, preparation, and
10 distribution of educational material designed to increase the
11 effectiveness of cooperative extension work as conducted by
12 the Department in cooperation with land-grant colleges,
13 $748,843, of which amount not to exceed $632,610 may be
14 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

15 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

16 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and ex-
18 penses of the Office of Administrator, and personal services
19 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

20 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

21 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
22 provisions of an Act entitled "An Act to provide for research
23 into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to
24 provide for the further development of cooperative agricul-
25 tural extension work and the more complete endowment and

1 support of land-grant colleges", approved June 29, 1935
2 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f) ; for administration of
3 the provisions of section 5 of the said Act, and for special
4 research work, including the planning, programing, co-
5 ordination, and printing the results of such research, to be
6 conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secre-
7 tary may designate or establish, and to which he may make
8 allotments from this fund, including the employment of
9 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
10 $1,226,364, of which amount $742,315 shall be available
11 for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories
12 and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for
13 by section 4 of said Act.

14 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

15 PAYMENT TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

16 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
17 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect
18 the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
19 experiment stations:

20 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
21 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
22 C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
23 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
24 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,463,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $22,500; in all, for Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,001,208: *Provided*, That in order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population, $63,708 of the appropriation in this paragraph under the Bankhead-Jones Act shall be available for allotment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For salaries and expenses, including personal

1 services in the District of Columbia, necessary to enable the
2 Secretary to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved
3 March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May
4 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June
5 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–
6 363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration
7 and for the administration of an agricultural experiment sta-
8 tion in Puerto Rico, $176,169, of which not to exceed
9 $166,122 may be expended for personal services in the
10 District of Columbia; and the Secretary shall prescribe the
11 form of the annual financial statement required under
12 the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are
13 in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the re-
14 search work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment
15 stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research
16 of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon
17 to Congress.

18 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: To enable
19 the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural
20 experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation,
21 illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and
22 not to exceed $8,000 for the erection and alteration of
23 buildings, $107,074; and the Secretary is authorized to
24 sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to
25 the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and

1 the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered
2 into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
3 receipts.

4 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For the employment of persons and means in the District
7 of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
8 $712,955 for departmental personal services in the
9 District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions
10 of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
11 Industry, and related Acts; and the Secretary, upon applica-
12 tion of any exporter, importer, packer, or owner of, or the
13 agent thereof, or dealer in, livestock, hides, skins, meat, or
14 other animal products, may in his discretion, make inspec-
15 tions and examinations at places other than the headquarters
16 of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge
17 the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence in-
18 curred for such inspections and examinations, the funds
19 derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury
20 of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from
21 which the expenses are paid; collect and disseminate infor-
22 mation concerning livestock and animal products; prepare
23 and disseminate reports on animal industry; purchase in the
24 open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins,
25 or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture,

1 which are sold in the United States, for the detection, pre-
2 vention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals,
3 test the same, and disseminate the results of said tests in
4 such manner as he may deem best, and purchase and destroy
5 diseased or exposed animals, including poultry, or quarantine
6 the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the
7 spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, contagious poultry
8 diseases, or other diseases of animals from one State to
9 another, as follows:

10 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
11 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
12 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
13 District of Columbia, $195,379.

14 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
15 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
16 breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural
17 experiment stations and other agencies, including repairs
18 and additions to and erection of buildings necessary to carry
19 on the experiments (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection
20 or alteration of any one building), $899,500.

21 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
22 diseases of animals, including the alteration and construction
23 of necessary buildings, at Beltsville, Maryland (not to exceed
24 $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one building),
25 and necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculin,

1 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $756,939: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That fees shall be charged for all diagnoses in con-
3 nection with rabies, except those performed for agencies of
4 the United States Government, in such amounts as the
5 Secretary shall prescribe, and such fees shall be covered
6 into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

7 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
8 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
9 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
10 disease of cattle, $5,240,355, together with not to exceed
11 $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation
12 for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided,* That in carrying out
13 the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Sec-
14 retary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tubercu-
15 lous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test
16 for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed,
17 condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his dis-
18 cretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations
19 as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or
20 elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary
21 for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals
22 but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money
23 hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners
24 of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary
25 to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or

1 municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take
2 place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as com-
3 pensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time
4 of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof,
5 it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm,
6 or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
7 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That
8 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compen-
9 sation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed
10 one-third of the difference between the appraised value of
11 such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no pay-
12 ment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid
13 by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the
14 animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any
15 payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal
16 or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

17 Hog-cholera control: For the control and eradication of
18 hog cholera and related swine diseases, by such means as
19 may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation
20 of organizations, and other methods, either independently
21 or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county
22 authorities, $114,288.

23 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
24 tine work, including the eradication of southern cattle ticks,
25 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the inspec-

1 tion of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation
2 of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of
3 the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of
4 imported animals, including the establishment and mainte-
5 nance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, im-
6 provements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspec-
7 tion work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
8 and the mallein testing of animals, $951,253.

9 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
10 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food prod-
11 ucts, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps,
12 and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to
13 public printing, $8,616,759.

14 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
15 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
16 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
17 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product
18 manufactured in the United States and the importation of
19 such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
20 animals, $272,115.

21 Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus
22 and serum: The sum of $37,007 of the appropriation
23 made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjust-
24 ment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made avail-
25 able during the fiscal year for which appropriations are

1 herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive,
2 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–
3 855), entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act, and for other purposes", including the employ-
5 ment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and
6 elsewhere.

7 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
8 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

9 In case of an emergency arising out of the existence
10 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
11 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of ani-
12 mals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the
13 livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city
14 of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of
15 appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to ex-
16 ceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such
17 disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past
18 and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with
19 the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of ma-
20 terials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease,
21 wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like
22 or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has
23 complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided,*
24 That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be

1 made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding
2 value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value
3 no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its
4 meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
5 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment
6 by the United States Government for any animals shall not
7 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
8 That the sum of $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the
9 appropriation of $3,500,000 contained in the Second De-
10 ficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1924, approved De-
11 cember 5, 1924, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth
12 disease and other contagious or infectious diseases of animals,
13 is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which
14 appropriations are herein made to enable the Secretary to
15 control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar
16 diseases in poultry.

17 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
19 ing not to exceed $410,345 for personal services in the
20 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in
21 carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924
22 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experi-
23 ments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative
24 investigations of the dairy industry in the various States,
25 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Acts of

1 May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c), 2327 (b)),
2 and August 10, 1912 (26 U. S. C. 2327 (c)), relating
3 to process or renovated butter, and the Act of May 23, 1908
4 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the expor-
5 tation of process or renovated butter, repairs to buildings,
6 and not to exceed $10,000 for the construction or alteration
7 of buildings, $812,958.

8 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL
9 ENGINEERING

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For the investigation of fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton,
12 tobacco, vegetables, grasses, forage, drug, medicinal, poison-
13 ous, fiber, and other plants and plant industries, of soils and
14 soil-plant relationships, and of the application of engineering
15 principles to agriculture, in cooperation with other branches of
16 the Department, the State experiment stations, and practical
17 farmers; for the erection or alteration of necessary farm build-
18 ings and buildings at the National Arboretum: *Provided*, That
19 the cost of any building erected or altered, except head houses
20 connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500; and for the
21 employment of persons and means in the city of Washing-
22 ton and elsewhere required for the investigations, experi-
23 ments, and demonstrations herein authorized, as follows:

24 General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses
25 for general administrative purposes, including the salary of

1 Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District
2 of Columbia, $225,000.

3 Agricultural engineering investigations: For investiga-
4 tions, experiments, and demonstrations involving the appli-
5 cation of engineering principles to agriculture; for investi-
6 gating and reporting upon the different kinds of farm power
7 and appliances; upon farm domestic water supply and sewage
8 disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings
9 and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and
10 storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical
11 farm equipment and rural electrification, upon the engineer-
12 ing problems relating to the processing, transportation, and
13 storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and
14 upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical
15 characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm
16 machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the
17 Act approved April 19, 1930 (7 U. S. C. 424, 425); for
18 giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural and chem-
19 ical engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the
20 results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and dis-
21 tributing bulletins, plans, and reports, $293,639.

22 Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and
23 improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of
24 cereal production and for the study and control of cereal
25 diseases, for the investigation of the cultivation and breed-

1 ing of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax
2 diseases, for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn
3 and methods of broomcorn production, and for determining
4 the distribution of weeds and means for their control,
5 $645,596.

6 Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: For investiga-
7 tion of the production of cotton and other fiber crops, including
8 the improvement by cultural methods, breeding, and selec-
9 tion, fiber yield and quality, cotton soil-fertility, and the
10 control of diseases, $456,702, of which sum not less than
11 $14,700 shall be used for experimenting in Sea Island cotton,
12 including its hybridization with other varieties.

13 Drug and related plants: For the investigation, testing,
14 and improvement of plants yielding drugs, spices, poisons,
15 oils, and related products and byproducts, $70,308.

16 Dry-land agriculture: For the investigation and im-
17 provement of methods of crop production under subhumid,
18 semiarid, or dry-land conditions, $245,000: *Provided*, That
19 no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establish-
20 ment of any new field station.

21 Forage crops and diseases: For the investigation and
22 improvement of forage crops, including grasses, alfalfas,
23 clovers, soybeans, lespedezas, vetches, cowpeas, field peas,
24 and miscellaneous legumes; for the investigation of green-
25 manure crops and cover crops; for investigations looking to

1 the improvement of pastures; and for the investigation of
2 forage-crop diseases and methods of control, $327,837.
3 Forest pathology: For the investigation of diseases of
4 forest and shade trees and forest products, including a study
5 of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi, bacteria,
6 viruses, and other causes of such diseases, for the purpose of
7 developing methods of control and eradication and deter-
8 mining their application, $255,300.
9 Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: For investiga-
10 tion and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of
11 culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activi-
12 ties concerned with the production of fruits, nuts, vegetables,
13 ornamentals, and related plants, for investigation of methods
14 of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing and utilizing these
15 products, and for studies of the physiological and related
16 changes of such products during processes of marketing and
17 while in commerical storage, $1,458,877.
18 Irrigation agriculture: For investigations of crop pro-
19 duction on irrigable lands, the quality of irrigation water
20 and its use by crops, and methods for improving and
21 maintaining the productivity of irrigated soils, $145,000.
22 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and devel-
23 opment of the National Arboretum established under the
24 provisions of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Sec-

1 retary of Agriculture to establish a National Arboretum, and
2 for other purposes", approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
3 191–194), employment of persons and means in the city of
4 Washington and elsewhere, and travel expenses of em-
5 ployees and advisory council, $31,500, of which not to
6 exceed $2,500 may be expended by contract or otherwise
7 for the services of consulting landscape architects without
8 reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or
9 civil-service rules.

10 Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: For
11 investigations in seed and plant introduction, including the
12 study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and dis-
13 tribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs,
14 vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from
15 our possessions, and also wild native plants, for experiments
16 with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this
17 country, for plant-disease investigations, including nema-
18 tology, and for plant and plant-disease collections and
19 surveys, $290,000.

20 Plant Industry Experiment Farm: For the maintenance
21 of a general experiment farm and agricultural station in the
22 vicinity of Beltsville, Maryland, $56,976.

23 Soil and fertilizer investigations: For soil and fertilizer
24 investigations, including soil minerals, soil organic matter, soil

1 solution, soil physical and chemical investigations, soil micro-
2 biology, including the testing of cultures procured in the open
3 market for inoculating legumes, other crops, or soil, and if
4 any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or mis-
5 branded, the results of the tests may be published, together
6 with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by
7 whom the cultures were offered for sale; for investigations
8 of the causes of soil infertility and the maintenance of soil
9 productivity; and for investigations within the United States
10 of fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, including phosphoric acid
11 and potash, and other soil amendments, and their suitability
12 for agricultural use, $346,791.

13 Soil survey: For the investigation of soils and their
14 origin, for survey of the extent of classes and types, and
15 for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise,
16 the results of such investigations and surveys, $162,582.

17 Sugar-plant investigations: For sugar-plant investiga-
18 tions, including studies of diseases and the improvement of
19 sugar beets and sugar-beet seed, sugarcane, and other sugar-
20 producing plants, cultural and production methods, and the
21 improvement and maintenance of soil fertility in relation to
22 sugar plants, $370,000.

23 Tobacco investigations: For the investigation and im-
24 provement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production
25 and handling, $131,020.

1 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses connected with investigations,
4 experiments, and demonstrations for the promotion of eco-
5 nomic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
6 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
7 agriculture, for investigating and importing useful and bene-
8 ficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of in-
9 sects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining
10 the best means of destroying insects affecting man and ani-
11 mals, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
12 visions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as
13 amended (7 U. S. C. 146, 147, 151–167, 281, 282), to
14 conduct other activities hereinafter authorized, and for the
15 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious
16 insects and plant pests, independently or in cooperation with
17 other branches of the Federal Government, States, counties,
18 municipalities, corporations, agencies, individuals, or with
19 foreign governments; including the employment of necessary
20 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
21 of which not to exceed $633,886 may be expended for
22 personal services in the District of Columbia, rent, con-
23 struction, alteration, or repair of necessary buildings outside

1 the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That, unless otherwise
2 specifically provided, the cost for the construction or altera-
3 tion of any building shall not exceed $1,500 and the total
4 amount expended for such construction in any one year shall
5 not exceed $7,000, as follows:

6 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
7 trative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau
8 and other personal services, $160,920.

9 Fruit insects: For insects affecting fruits, grapes, and
10 nuts, $457,230.

11 Japanese beetle control: For the control and preven-
12 tion of spread of the Japanese beetle, $400,000: *Provided,*
13 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the
14 cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

15 Sweetpotato weevil control: For the determination and
16 application of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils
17 as, in the judgment of the Secretary, may be necessary,
18 $78,670: *Provided,* That in the discretion of the Secre-
19 tary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
20 control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State
21 has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this pur-
22 pose: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation
23 shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm
24 crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

25 Mexican fruitfly control: For the control and prevention

1 of spread of the Mexican fruitfly, including necessary surveys
2 and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the
3 Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $169,820.
4 Gypsy and brown-tail moth control: For the control
5 and prevention of spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths,
6 $409,320.
7 Dutch elm disease control: For determining and apply-
8 ing methods of control and prevention of spread of the
9 disease of elm trees known as "Dutch elm disease" and of
10 a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley,
11 $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That, in
12 the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this
13 appropriation shall be made for applying methods of con-
14 trol of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures
15 for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
16 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
17 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential
18 or appropiate for the carrying on of the control program,
19 nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures
20 shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by
21 State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organi-
22 zations concerned: *Provided further*, That expenditures in-
23 curred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not
24 be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions,
25 or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this ap-

1 propriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction
2 of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where
3 such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the
4 Government of the United States, or on property included
5 within local experimental control areas: *Provided further,*
6 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost
7 or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

8 Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication: For deter-
9 mining and applying such methods of eradication, control,
10 and prevention of spread of the diseases of peach trees known
11 as "phony peach" and "peach mosaic" as in the judgment
12 of the Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation
13 with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations
14 of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to
15 accomplish such purposes, including the certification of prod-
16 ucts out of the infested areas to meet the requirements of
17 State quarantines, $99,340: *Provided,* That no part of the
18 money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or
19 value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

20 Forest insects: For insects affecting forests and forest
21 products, under section 4 of the Act approved May 22, 1928
22 (16 U. S. C. 581c), entitled "An Act to insure adequate
23 supplies of timber and other forest products for the people
24 of the United States, to promote the full use for timber grow-
25 ing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States,

1 including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not
2 suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correla-
3 tion and the most economical conduct of forest research in
4 the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforest-
5 ation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest eco-
6 nomics, and related subjects", and for insects affecting orna-
7 mental trees and shrubs, $202,000.

8 Truck crop and garden insects: For insects affecting truck
9 crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco,
10 sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $326,340.

11 Cereal and forage insects: For insects affecting cereal
12 and forage crops, including sugarcane and rice, and including
13 research on the European corn borer, $403,370.

14 Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the com-
15 mon barberry and for applying such other methods of
16 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of cereal
17 rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary
18 to accomplish such purposes, $258,470: *Provided,* That,
19 in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from
20 this appropriation shall be made for these purposes until a
21 sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have
22 been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
23 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
24 tions for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*
25 *further,* That no part of the money herein appropriated

1 shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured
2 or destroyed.

3 Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $163,730.

4 Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the
5 control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil
6 and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such
7 cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any
8 infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations
9 in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or
10 local Mexican authorities, $738,960.

11 Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and
12 the propagation and distribution by sale of surplus bee-breed-
13 ing stock, $91,950: *Provided*, That the rates at which such
14 sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary
15 and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treas-
16 ury as miscellaneous receipts.

17 Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting
18 man, household possessions, and animals, $175,000.

19 Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identifica-
20 tion and classification of insects, including taxonomic, mor-
21 phological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the
22 maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and
23 dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other
24 agencies concerned with insect-pest control, $145,000.

25 Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in con-

1 nection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious
2 insects and related pests and for the exchange with other
3 countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods,
4 $20,000.

5 Control investigations: For developing equipment or
6 apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication
7 and control of plant pests, determining methods of disin-
8 fecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests,
9 determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases
10 of insect-pest control, $76,485, of which not less than
11 $10,000 shall be used for methyl bromide investigations.

12 Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the inves-
13 tigation and development of methods of manufacturing
14 insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical
15 problems relating to the composition, action, and applica-
16 tion of insecticides and fungicides, $130,520.

17 Transit inspection: For the inspection in transit or
18 otherwise of articles quarantined under the Act of August
19 20, 1912 (7 U. S. C. 161, 164a), as amended, and for the
20 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
21 transported interstate in violation of quarantines promulgated
22 thereunder, $45,900.

23 Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign
24 plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export,
25 and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from

1 Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of
2 the entry into the United States of railway cars and other
3 vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials
4 from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection
5 thereof, including construction and repair of necessary build-
6 ings, plants, and equipment, for the fumigation, disinfection,
7 or cleaning of products, railway cars, or other vehicles enter-
8 ing the United States from Mexico, $797,700: *Provided,*
9 That any moneys received in payment of charges fixed by
10 the Secretary on account of such cleaning and disinfection
11 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
12 Certification of exports: For the inspection, under such
13 rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, of
14 domestic plants and plant products when offered for export
15 and to certify to shippers and interested parties as to the
16 freedom of such products from injurious plant diseases and
17 insect pests according to the sanitary requirements of the
18 foreign countries affected and to make such reasonable
19 charges and to use such means as may be necessary to ac-
20 complish this object, $34,480: *Provided,* That moneys
21 received on account of such inspection and certification shall
22 be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
23 CONTROL OF INCIPIENT AND EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF
24 INSECT PESTS AND PLANT DISEASES
25 Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect

1 pests and plant diseases: To enable the Secretary to carry
2 out the provisions of and for expenditures authorized by
3 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
4 148–148e), including surveys and control operations in
5 Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or
6 local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian
7 citizens, $2,700,000.

8 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations
11 hereinafter authorized, independently or in cooperation with
12 other branches of the Department, other departments or
13 agencies of the Federal Government, States, State agricul-
14 tural experiment stations, universities, and other State
15 agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business,
16 farm, or other organizations and corporations, individuals,
17 associations, and scientific societies, including the employ-
18 ment of necessary persons and means in the city of Wash-
19 ington and elsewhere, of which not to exceed $198,280 may
20 be expended for personal services in the District of Colum-
21 bia; and for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings out-
22 side the District of Columbia at a total cost not to exceed
23 $15,000, as follows:

24 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-

1 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
2 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
3 District of Columbia, $82,250.

4 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
5 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
6 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of
7 chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physi-
8 cal, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods,
9 feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances
10 used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the
11 physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of
12 such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and
13 development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar
14 sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural
15 materials for such purposes; for the technological investiga-
16 tion of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen
17 pack investigations; and to cooperate with associations and
18 scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis,
$313,411.

19 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
20 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
21 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
22 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
23 stores; the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and
24 utilization of naval stores; and for the assembling and com-

1 pilation of data on production, distribution, and consumption
2 of turpentine and rosin, pursuant to the Act of August 15,
3 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), $112,100.

4 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the
5 researches established under the provisions of section 202
6 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II, and subject to the
7 provisions of section 393 of title III, of the Agricultural
8 Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292, 1393),
9 including research on food products of farm commodities,
10 $4,244,600.

11 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

12 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
13 ing not to exceed $290,400 for personal services in the
14 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition
15 and Home Economics for conducting either independently
16 or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of
17 the relative utility and economy of agricultural products
18 for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special
19 suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective
20 utilization of such products for these purposes, and such
21 economic investigations, including housing and household
22 buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the
23 rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this
24 subject, $806,630.

1 BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER

2 For general administrative purposes, including main-
3 tenance, operation, construction, or alteration of necessary
4 buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500 for any one build-
5 ing, repairs, and other expenses, $130,760: *Provided,* That
6 the appropriation current at the time services are rendered
7 may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements
8 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
9 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and other
10 related services, for equipment rentals (including depre-
11 ciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
12 equipment and materials furnished, stores of which may
13 be maintained at the Center, and for building construction,
14 alteration, and repair performed by the Center in carrying
15 out the purposes of such applicable appropriations and the
16 applicable appropriations may also be charged their pro-
17 portionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
18 Center not covered by this appropriation.

19 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

20 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
21 out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act for forest pro-
22 tection against the white pine blister rust, approved April
23 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), and in accordance with the
24 provisions thereof, including the employment of persons and
25 means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,264,026;

1 of which amount $203,173 shall be available to the
2 Department of the Interior for control of white pine
3 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the juris-
4 diction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which
5 are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of
6 the United States; $1,219,900 of said amount to the
7 Forest Service for the control of white pine blister
8 rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and
9 $840,953 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology
10 and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordina-
11 tion of the entire program, method development, and
12 for operations conducted under its direction for such con-
13 trol, including, but not confined to, cooperation with
14 individual States, local authorites and private agencies in the
15 control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State
16 and privately owned lands.

17 FOREST SERVICE

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For the employment of persons and means in the Dis-
20 trict of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
21 $887,074 for departmental personal services in the District
22 of Columbia, and to enable the Secretary to experiment
23 and to make and continue investigations and report on for-
24 estry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no
25 part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment

1 or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to
2 advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the
3 same; to investigate and test American timber and timber
4 trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treat-
5 ment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the plant-
6 ing of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the tree-
7 less regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the
8 cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,
9 exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply
10 or sanitary system and of connecting the same with
11 any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower
12 upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not
13 exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected,
14 purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or
15 more, may be improved out of the appropriations made
16 under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to
17 exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified
18 by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the
19 national forests, including tree planting and other measures
20 to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the
21 formation of floods, and to conserve water and including
22 the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary
23 for information leading to the arrest and conviction for
24 violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or
25 near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury

1 to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions
2 upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care
3 for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or
4 the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate
5 the results of experiments and investigations made by the
6 Forest Service; to purchase lawbooks, reference and tech-
7 nical books, and technical journals for officers of the Forest
8 Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical
9 supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the
10 immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees
11 engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service:
12 *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,500 may be
13 expended for the contribution of the United States to the
14 cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Union
15 of Forest Research Stations and of the Department of
16 Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois:
17 *Provided further,* That the appropriations for the work of
18 the Forest Service shall be available for meeting the expenses
19 of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and
20 handling of supplies, equipment, and materials stored therein
21 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Forest
22 Service and for sale and distribution to other Government
23 activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate
24 with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written
25 cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment,

1 and materials, including the cost of supervision, transporta-
2 tion, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appro-
3 priations current at the time additional supplies and materials
4 are procured for warehouse stocks: *Provided further,* That
5 the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service avail-
6 able for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replace-
7 ment of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for
8 use of such equipment on projects of the Forest Service
9 chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other
10 Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reim-
11 bursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the
12 work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief
13 Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation,
14 repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment manage-
15 ment control, and credited to appropriations currently avail-
16 able at the time adjustment is effected: *Provided further,*
17 That the Forest Service may rent equipment for fire-control
18 purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal
19 agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control
20 under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the
21 amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropria-
22 tions currently available at the time payment is received,
23 as follows:
24 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
25 penses for general administrative purposes, including the

1 salary of the Chief Forester, for the necessary expenses of
2 the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized
3 by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
4 514), and for other personal services in the District of
5 Columbia, $625,000.

6 National forest protection and management: For the
7 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
8 and development of the national forests, including the
9 establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries,
10 including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
11 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
12 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
13 maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract
14 or otherwise, with authority to renew any contract for
15 such purpose annually, not more than twice, without addi-
16 tional advertising; the maintenance of roads and trails and
17 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
18 necessary for the proper and economical administration,
19 protection, development, and use of the national forests,
20 including experimental areas under Forest Service administra-
21 tion, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary,
22 direct purchases will be more economical than construction,
23 improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to
24 exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and
25 maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control

1 of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cul-
2 tural operations; development and application of fish
3 and game management plans; propagation and transplant-
4 ing of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions
5 of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber
6 and other resources and development and application
7 of plans for their effective management, sale, and use;
8 acceptance of moneys from timber purchasers for de-
9 posit into the Treasury in the trust account, Forest Service
10 Cooperative Fund, which moneys are hereby appropriated
11 and made available until expended for scaling services
12 requested by purchasers in addition to those required by the
13 Forest Service, and for refunds of amounts deposited in
14 excess of the cost of such work; examination, classification,
15 surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting ex-
16 changes authorized by law and of lands within the
17 boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to
18 homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
19 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
20 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
21 512); investigation and establishment of water rights,
22 including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in
23 lands or rights-of-ways for use and protection of water
24 rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the admin-
25 istration and public use of the national forests; and all

1 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
2 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
3 including lands under contract for purchase or for the
4 acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been
5 instituted under the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
6 521), and the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499,
7 505, 564–570), lands transferred by authority of the Secre-
8 tary from the Resettlement Administration to the Forest
9 Service, and lands transferred to the Forest Service under
10 authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
11 $17,729,426: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be avail-
12 able for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of
13 persons who have lost their lives as a result of fighting fires
14 while employed by the Forest Service: *Provided further,*
15 That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood,
16 and other forest products the amounts made available for
17 schools and roads by the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C.
18 500), and the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501),
19 shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber.
20 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
21 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
22 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
23 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
24 unappropriated public forest lands, $100,000, which amount

1 shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preced-
2 ing fiscal year.

3 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
4 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
5 entitled "An Act to insure adequate supplies of timber and
6 other forest products for the people of the United States,
7 to promote the full use for timber growing and other pur-
8 poses of forest lands in the United States, including farm
9 wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agri-
10 cultural production, and to secure the correlation and the
11 most economical conduct of forest research in the Depart-
12 ment of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber
13 growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related
14 subjects", approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C.
15 581, 581a, 581f–581i), as follows:

16 Forest management: Fire, silvicultural, and other forest
17 investigations and experiments under said section 2, as
18 amended, at forest experiment stations or elsewhere,
19 $498,848.

20 Range investigations: Investigations and experiments to
21 develop improved methods of management of forest and
22 other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment
23 stations or elsewhere, $288,475.

24 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests

1 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
2 Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,092,519.
3 Forest survey: A comprehensive forest survey under
4 section 9, $156,246.
5 Forest economics: Investigations in forest economics
6 under section 10, $74,018.
7 Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at
8 forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and
9 demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover char-
10 acteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water
11 conservation, flood control, stream-flow regulation, erosion,
12 climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for de-
13 veloping preventive and control measures therefor, $86,762.
14 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION
15 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
16 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
17 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
18 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act en-
19 titled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for
20 the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of
21 national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote
22 the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable
23 therefor", approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C.
24 564–570), $2,500,000, and in addition thereto $29,062 to
25 carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of

1943; in all, $2,529,062, of which not to exceed $64,226 and $5,000 shall be available for personal services and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively, in the District of Columbia.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $532,038) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,728), of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance

1 of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not
2 to exceed $781,466, of which not to exceed $50,958 may
3 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia;
4 the purchase of reference books and technical journals;
5 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or
6 purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
7 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is avail-
8 able for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and
9 sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924,
10 shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the
11 State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or in-
12 dividuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that
13 to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make
14 contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to
15 be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any
16 part of this appropriation allocated for the production or
17 procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds
18 appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to co-
19 operating States for the production or procurement of nursery
20 stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more
21 than three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying
22 into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry
23 Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish
24 new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such
25 new nurseries.

1 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

2 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
3 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
4 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, of which not to exceed
5 $20,030 may be expended for personal services in the Dis-
6 trict of Columbia.

7 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

8 For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the
9 Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23
10 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and
11 maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under
12 Forest Service administration, including not to exceed
13 $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
14 $4,161,496 for forest development roads and trails, to be
15 immediately available and to remain available until expended:
16 *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the
17 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
18 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and sup-
19 plies used for road and trail construction and maintenance,
20 but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered,
21 or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed
22 $7,500.

23 EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

24 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
25 carry into effect the Act of March 5, 1942, as amended

1 (7 U. S. C. 171–175), including personal services in the
2 District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding
3 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and
5 periodicals; purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; erection
6 of necessary buildings; procurement of medical supplies or
7 services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance
8 of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, and furnish-
9 ing to employees daily transportation between points of
10 assembly and work projects, including the cost of progres-
11 sive and final liquidation of all of said project during the
12 fiscal year 1945, there is hereby continued available, in
13 accordance with section 3 of said Act of March 5, 1942,
14 not to exceed $3,952,585 of the unobligated balances of
15 appropriations made under this head for the fiscal years
16 1942 and 1943, which balances shall be merged with the
17 appropriation made under this head in the Department of
18 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided,* That any
19 proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from
20 guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales,
21 rentals, and fees resulting from operations under such Act
22 of March 5, 1942, as amended, shall be covered into the
23 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

24 WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

25 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable

1 the War Food Administration to perform its functions, in-
2 cluding those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310,
3 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by
4 transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private
5 agencies and individuals, other personal services in the
6 District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with
7 the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and com-
8 pensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjust-
9 ment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the tem-
10 porary employment of persons or organizations by contract
11 or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of
12 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary
13 expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of sub-
14 sistence, of persons serving while away from their perma-
15 nent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by
16 the War Food Administration, without other compensation
17 from the United States, except that such expenditures shall
18 not exceed $200,000; printing and binding; the purchase of
19 lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed
20 $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and
21 maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia)
22 of passenger-carrying vehicles; $29,200,000: *Provided*,
23 That the applicable appropriations available to the War
24 Food Administration, current at the time services are ren-
25 dered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed

1 by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by
2 advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or esti-
3 mated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration,
4 incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such non-
5 governmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided*
6 *further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall
7 be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under
8 which assessments are made against producers or handlers
9 of agricultural products for administration of such orders:
10 *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall
11 be used for agricultural wage stabilization.

12 COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

13 Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed
14 $5,458,526 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation
15 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Cor-
16 poration in carrying out its activities as authorized by law,
17 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
18 elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standard-
19 ized Government Travel Regulations and the Act of June 3,
20 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and
21 binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed
22 $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; procurement
23 of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the District
24 of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
25 *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and

1 special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but
2 not including other personal services) in connection with the
3 acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dis-
4 position of any real or personal property belonging to the
5 Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses
6 of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as
7 nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Pro-*
8 *vided further,* That none of the fund made available by this
9 paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until
10 an appropriate appropriation account shall have been estab-
11 lished therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a
12 covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be ac-
13 counted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and
14 Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further,*
15 That none of the fund made available by this paragraph
16 shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the
17 sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks
18 of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by
19 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable
20 price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1,
21 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-8) : *Provided further,*
22 That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other dis-
23 position of any agricultural commodity substantially deterio-
24 rated in quality or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the

1 extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for
2 seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further,* That no
3 wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the
4 parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided*
5 *further,* That in making regional adjustments in the sale
6 price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher
7 in any area than the United States average parity price of
8 corn.

9 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL
10 LAND RESOURCES

11 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
12 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclu-
13 sive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act,
14 approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C.
15 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjust-
16 ment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407)
17 (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and
18 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including per-
19 sonal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not
20 to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of ex-
21 hibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and inter-
22 national fairs within the United States; purchase of law-
23 books, books of reference, periodicals, $290,000,000, to
24 remain available until December 31, 1945, for compliance

1 with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural
2 Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of Feb-
3 ruary 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of
4 the 1944 programs carried out during the period July 1,
5 1943, to December 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided,* That
6 no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation
7 in this Act shall be used for incentive or production ad-
8 justment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-
9 conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment
10 commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricul-
11 tural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enu-
12 merated and set forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conserva-
13 tion Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided*
14 *further,* That not to exceed $24,250,000 of said amount shall
15 be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other ad-
16 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not
17 more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the
18 schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the
19 appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricul-
20 tural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred: *Provided*
21 *further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or
22 made available for the functions assigned to the Agricul-
23 tural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
24 (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
25 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information

1 employees or any State or county information employees,
2 but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or sup-
3 plying of information to individual farmers: *Provided fur-*
4 *ther,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and
5 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-
6 lation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-build-
7 ing practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under
8 the Act of February 29, 1936, and like programs under the
9 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total
10 expenditures of which, including administration, shall not
11 exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, ferti-
12 lizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand
13 at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants
14 under the 1945 program; but the payments or grants under
15 such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of
16 land with respect to which such payments or grants are
17 to be made, in conformity with farming practices which
18 will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-
19 water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective
20 manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as
21 determined and approved by the State Committee of the
22 Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States:
23 *Provided further,* That no part of such amounts shall
24 be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and
25 other administrative expenses except for payment of ob-

1 ligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Pro-*
2 *vided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion,
3 from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office
4 such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative ex-
5 penses of the General Accounting Office in auditing pay-
6 ments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount
7 shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime,
8 trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing
9 services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers
10 to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by
11 the Secretary in the 1944 and 1945 programs under said
12 Act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimburse-
13 ment of any Federal, State, or local government agency
14 for such materials, or services, and for the payment of all
15 expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or
16 part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided*
17 *further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law,
18 persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as
19 tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United
20 States Government and who comply with the terms and condi-
21 tions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, form-
22 ulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said Act
23 of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and
24 receive payments for their participation in said program to
25 the same extent as other producers: *Provided further*, That

1 no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the
2 Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau
3 or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used
4 to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages
5 in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but
6 not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign
7 funds of political parties or to any organization, association,
8 corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or in-
9 fluencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political
10 office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or
11 contributions for the distribution of publications and other
12 literature designed to influence or aid in the election or
13 defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in
14 activities designed to influence the action of Congress with
15 respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except
16 that employees may furnish to Congress any information
17 authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by
18 Congress, or by any of its committees or members).

19 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

20 Administrative and operating expenses: For operating
21 and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insur-
22 ance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7
23 U. S. C. 1501–1518), including the employment of persons
24 and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, print-
25 ing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference,

1 and periodicals, there is hereby reappropriated not to exceed
2 $100,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation
3 made for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30,
4 1944: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall
5 be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat
6 and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for
7 any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation
8 of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted
9 prior to July 31, 1943.

10 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

11 To carry out the provisions of an Act entitled "An Act
12 to provide for the protection of land resources against soil
13 erosion, and for other purposes", approved April 27, 1935
14 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national
15 program of erosion control and soil and moisture conserva-
16 tion to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other
17 agencies, including the employment of persons and means
18 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to
19 exceed $1,089,837 may be expended for personal serv-
20 ices in the District of Columbia, purchase of books
21 and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one
22 passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia,
23 furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees,
24 and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent
25 buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased,

1 erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing
2 a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same
3 with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where
4 buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being pur-
5 chased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to
6 be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
7 *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this Act
8 shall be available for the construction of any such building
9 on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*,
10 That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are
11 herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil
12 Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the
13 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,
14 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment
15 stored therein for distribution to projects under the super-
16 vision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and
17 distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such
18 supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (in-
19 cluding the cost of transportation and handling) to be reim-
20 bursed to appropriations current at the time additional
21 supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the
22 appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such
23 supplies, materials, or equipment, as follows:
24 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
25 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects

1 of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil
2 and moisture conservation (including the construction and
3 hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage) ; and
4 for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental
5 watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations,
6 $1,225,000.

7 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preven-
8 tive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such
9 special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and
10 the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of
11 farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and
12 operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation
13 plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
14 $28,340,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appro-
15 priation may be expended for soil and water con-
16 servation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided*
17 *further,* That any part of this appropriation allocated for
18 the production or procurement of nursery stock by any
19 Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency
20 for allocation to cooperating States for the production or
21 procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for
22 expenditure for not more than three fiscal years.

23 Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For
24 research and demonstration work in soil conservation
25 control measures, including research and demonstration work

1 in fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate
2 fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $72,248:
3 *Provided,* That no expenditures shall be made for these pur-
4 poses until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall
5 have been made available by the State of Florida, or a
6 political subdivision thereof, for the same purposes.

7 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
8 SUBMARGINAL LAND

9 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
10 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
11 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), including the em-
12 ployment of persons and means in the District of Columbia
13 and elsewhere, $1,250,000.

14 SUGAR ACT

15 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions,
16 other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands,
17 of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as
18 amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including the employ-
19 ment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and
20 elsewhere, as authorized by said Act, $52,510,203, to remain
21 available until June 30, 1946.

22 MARKETING SERVICE

23 For the employment of such persons and means in the
24 city of Washington and elsewhere (including not to exceed
25 $1,408,617 for departmental personal services in the Dis-

1 trict of Columbia) as may be necessary in conducting in-
2 vestigations, experiments, and demonstrations, either inde-
3 pendently or in cooperation with public or private agencies,
4 organizations, or individuals, as follows:

5 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
6 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely infor-
7 mation on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
8 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
9 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
10 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and
11 their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and
12 other agricultural products, independently and in coopera-
13 tion with other branches of the Government, State agencies,
14 purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons en-
15 gaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and dis-
16 tribution of farm and food products, $1,267,290.

17 Market inspection of farm products: For enabling
18 the Secretary, independently and in cooperation with other
19 branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and
20 consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of com-
21 merce, or other associations of businessmen or trade organiza-
22 tions, and persons or corporations engaged in the production,
23 transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food
24 products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions,
25 to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested

1 parties the class, quality, and condition of cotton, tobacco,
2 fruits, and vegetables, whether raw, dried, canned, or other-
3 wise processed, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm
4 products when offered for interstate shipment or when re-
5 ceived at such important central markets as the Secretary may
6 from time to time designate, or at points which may be con-
7 veniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations
8 as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be
9 reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for
10 the service rendered: *Provided,* That officers and employees
11 who, under proper authorization, use privately owned motor
12 vehicles in the performance of official travel within the
13 corporate limits of their official stations for the purpose of
14 inspecting and grading farm and food products and the
15 supervision thereof at points located within the said cor-
16 porate limits may be reimbursed for such travel at a rate
17 not to exceed 3 cents per mile: *Provided further,* That
18 certificates issued by the authorized agents of the Depart-
19 ment shall be received in all courts of the United States
20 as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein
21 contained, $547,679.

22 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
23 among the people of the United States useful information
24 relative to the standardization, classification, grading, prep-
25 aration for market, handling, and marketing of farm and

1 food products, including the demonstration and promotion
2 of the use of uniform standards of classification of American
3 farm and food products throughout the world, and for making
4 analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7,
5 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), $451,500: *Provided,* That
6 samples, illustrations, practical forms, or sets of the grades
7 recommended or promulgated by the Secretary for farm or
8 food products may be sold under such rules and regulations
9 as he may prescribe, and the receipts therefrom deposited
10 in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

11 Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards
12 Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
13 visions of an Act entitled "An Act to establish and promote
14 the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide
15 and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for
16 other purposes", approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C.
17 511–511q), and an Act entitled "An Act to provide for
18 the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the
19 Department of Agriculture", approved January 14, 1929
20 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, $933,500.

21 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
22 and Standard Container Acts: To enable the Secretary to
23 carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural
24 Commodities Act, approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7
25 U. S. C. 499a–499r), and the Act to prevent the

1 destruction or dumping of farm produce, and for other
2 purposes, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491–
3 497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916,
4 as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the Act to fix stand-
5 ards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets
6 for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes, approved
7 May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $210,000.

8 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts:
9 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of
10 the Act authorizing him to collect and publish statistics of
11 the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3,
12 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
13 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by
14 chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton
15 futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect
16 the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act,
17 approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
18 including such means as may be necessary for effectuating
19 agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and
20 other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the
21 adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton
22 classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes
23 with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution,
24 inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies
25 thereof under such agreements, $1,210,783.

1 United States Grain Standards Act: To enable the
2 Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United
3 States Grain Standards Act, $860,999.
4 United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary
5 to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Ware-
6 house Act, $533,930.
7 Federal Seed Act: To enable the Secretary to carry
8 into effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to
9 regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require
10 labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in inter-
11 state commerce; to require certain standards with respect to
12 certain imported seeds; and for other purposes", approved
13 August 9, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 1561–1610), $117,700: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That not to exceed $250 of this amount may be used
15 for meeting the share of the United States in the expenses
16 of the International Seed Testing Congress in carrying out
17 plans for correlating the work of the various adhering gov-
18 ernments on problems relating to seed analysis or other
19 subjects which the Congress may determine to be necessary
20 in the interest of international seed trade.
21 Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the pro-
22 visions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
23 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
24 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $418,700.
25 Naval Stores Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry

1 into effect the provisions of the Naval Stores Act of March
2 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 91–99), $34,728.

3 Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry
4 into effect the provisions of the Act of April 26, 1910 (7
5 U. S. C. 121–134), entitled "An Act for preventing the
6 manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or mis-
7 branded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and
8 also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other
9 purposes", $215,208.

10 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary to
11 carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange
12 Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), and as further
13 amended by the Act of October 9, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 2),
14 $348,797.

15 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the
16 provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II
17 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C.
18 1291), $78,762.

19 FARM TENANCY

20 To enable the Secretary through the War Food Admin-
21 istration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the
22 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
23 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in con-
25 nection with the making of loans under title I of the

1 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
2 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due
3 the United States on account of loans heretofore made under
4 the provisions of said Act, including the employment of
5 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
6 exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said
7 Act, $750,000.

8 Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance
9 with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
10 approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006),
11 $15,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Re-
12 construction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3
13 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used
14 for making loans under the terms of said Act for the pur-
15 chase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit
16 of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality
17 in which such purchase may be made, which value shall
18 be determined solely according to statistics of the farm
19 census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
20 poration is hereby authorized and directed to lend such
21 sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obliga-
22 tions of borrowers from the Secretary under the pro-
23 visions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
24 Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006):
25 *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction

1 Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the
2 principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting
3 the security therefor: *Provided further,* That the Secretary
4 may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest
5 on any loans made under such title I to repay the Recon-
6 struction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed there-
7 from under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further,*
8 That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such
9 obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation
10 is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding
11 at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by
12 an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

13 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

14 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
15 sions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved
16 May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), as
17 follows:

18 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and
19 expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports
20 including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrifica-
21 tion Administration, and other personal services in the Dis-
22 trict of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange
23 of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and
24 periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to
25 exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $2,550,000.

1 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
2 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses
3 incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section
4 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as
5 amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

6 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Admin-
9 istration in the District of Columbia and the field, including
10 printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to
11 exceed $5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority
12 attending meetings or conventions of members of organiza-
13 tions at which matters of importance to the work of the
14 Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or trans-
15 acted; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $750
16 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic
17 reporting services; library membership fees or dues in
18 organizations which issue publications to members only or
19 to members at a lower price than to others, payment for
20 which may be made in advance; not to exceed $10,000 for
21 purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by
22 personal service without regard to the provisions of any
23 other Act; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation
24 of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in the District
25 of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of

1 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
2 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
3 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
4 without other compensation from the United States, in an
5 advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except
6 that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; not to ex-
7 ceed $10,000 for employment of persons, firms, and others for
8 the performance of special services, including legal services;
9 necessary administrative expenses in connection with the
10 making of loans under the provisions of the Act of January
11 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), and the collec-
12 tion of moneys due the United States on account of loans
13 made under the provisions of said Act and similar Acts
14 administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating
15 to loans for crop production, feed, seed, and harvesting;
16 examination of corporations, banks, associations, and in-
17 stitutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm
18 Credit Administration: *Provided*, That hereafter the ex-
19 penses and salaries of employees engaged in such exam-
20 inations shall be assessed against the said corporations,
21 banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of
22 existing laws except that the amounts collected from the
23 Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal in-
24 termediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916,
25 as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the

1 Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administra-
2 tion shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administra-
3 tion of the administrative supervision of the Federal land
4 banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate
5 credit banks, and the production credit corporations for
6 each fiscal year and shall apportion the amount so
7 determined among such banks and corporations on such equi-
8 table basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall
9 assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks
10 and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered
11 into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which
12 fund is hereby made available to said Administration for
13 expenditure for the purposes set forth in its annual
14 appropriation: *Provided further,* That as soon as practicable
15 after June 30 of each fiscal year said Administration
16 shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the
17 cost of the examination services rendered during such
18 fiscal year to each Federal land bank, joint stock
19 land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2)
20 the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated
21 to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal in-
22 termediate credit bank, and production credit corporation
23 as the cost during such fiscal year of their administrative
24 supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case
25 is greater than the total amount collected from the bank

1 or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be
2 collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be
3 refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation
4 entitled thereto; in all, $626,321, together with not to ex-
5 ceed $4,459,480 from the funds made available to the
6 Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the Act of January
7 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o).

8 Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans: For
9 loans to farmers under the Act of January 29, 1937 (12
10 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), as amended by the Acts of
11 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
12 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
13 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
14 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), the un-
15 obligated balance (exclusive of the amount of such balance
16 made available for "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Ad-
17 ministration, 1945") of the appropriation "Crop production
18 and harvesting loans" as made in the First Deficiency Ap-
19 propriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (Act of February 9, 1937,
20 Public Law 4), and as continued available by the Acts of
21 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
22 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
23 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
24 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), is
25 hereby made available, together with all collections of prin-

1 cipal and interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made
2 under said Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–
3 1020n, 1020o).

4 FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

5 Not to exceed $8,200,000 of the funds of the Federal
6 Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the Act of
7 January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h), shall be
8 available during the fiscal year 1945 for administrative
9 expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in
10 the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses of
11 officers and employees of the Corporation, in accordance
12 with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and
13 the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833);
14 printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, and not
15 to exceed $250 for periodicals and newspapers; contract
16 stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies,
17 equipment, and services; purchase, maintenance, repair, and
18 operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to
19 be used only for official purposes; rent in the District of
20 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
21 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
22 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
23 without other compensation from the United States, in an
24 advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a con-
25 tract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the

1 performance of special services, including legal services; use
2 of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national
3 farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies
4 of the Government as authorized by said Act of January
5 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
6 *Provided*, That all expenditures which under the accounting
7 system prescribed for the Corporation by the General
8 Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments,
9 increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real
10 estate and chattel), shall be considered as nonadministrative
11 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That
12 except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified,
13 and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the admin-
14 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation
15 shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the
16 provisions of said Act of January 31, 1934, as amended
17 (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

18 GENERAL PROVISIONS

19 SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this
20 Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to
21 pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee
22 of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office,
23 agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation,
24 institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or
25 approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or em-

1 ployee of the Department or of any such bureau, office,
2 agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to
3 make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the pro-
4 visions of food production financing bulletins F–1 or F–2,
5 issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under
6 the Food Production Administration, Production Loans
7 Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the
8 applicant represents in writing and it is administratively
9 determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the
10 production of the crops or livestock specified in the appli-
11 cation is not available to him from sources other than the
12 Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from
13 other sources only on such terms and conditions that he
14 could not use the other credit available to the extent neces-
15 sary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or live-
16 stock specified in his application and (b) the person author-
17 ized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional
18 Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity
19 of the crops or livestock specified in the application would
20 be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than
21 would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance
22 under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency
23 Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148),
24 as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins
25 F–1 and F–2 made or approved on the conditions specified

1 in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or
2 advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of
3 the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within
4 one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region
5 which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated
6 as a region in which the making of such loans or advances
7 is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or
8 livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such
9 region: *Provided,* That none of the limitations provided for
10 by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance
11 made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing
12 the completion of production undertaken before July 12,
13 1943, or for the purpose of protecting or preserving
14 the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of
15 any loan or advance made or approved before such date.

16 SEC. 3. Not to exceed 7 per centum of the foregoing
17 amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any
18 bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be
19 available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects
20 included within the general expenses of such bureau,
21 division, or office, but no more than 7 per centum shall be
22 added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of
23 extraordinary emergency.

24 SEC. 4. During the fiscal year for which appropriations
25 are herein made the head of any department or independent

1 establishment of the Government requiring inspections,
2 analyses, and tests of food and other products, within the
3 scope of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and
4 which that Department is unable to perform within the limits
5 of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary,
6 transfer to the Department for direct expenditure such sums
7 as may be necessary for the performance of such work.

8 SEC. 5. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the
9 lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department
10 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and
11 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the
12 conduct of the field work of the Department outside the Dis-
13 trict of Columbia: *Provided,* That such vehicles shall be used
14 only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but
15 this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of
16 motortrucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,*
17 That appropriations contained in this Act shall be available
18 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled
19 and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided fur-*
20 *ther,* That the funds available to the Agricultural Adjust-
21 ment Agency may be used for the maintenance, repair, and
22 operation of one passenger-carrying vehicle in the District
23 of Columbia.

24 SEC. 6. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
25 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary

1 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
2 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of
3 emergency of persons in the field service of the Department
4 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
5 on the emergency rubber project; (4) employment by the
6 Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed twenty
7 junior engineer trainees who are citizens of other American
8 republics; and (5) employment under the appropriation for
9 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

10 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this
11 Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person
12 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
13 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
14 States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the pur-
15 poses hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie
16 evidence that the person making the affidavit does not
17 advocate, and is not a member of an organization that
18 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
19 States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That such
20 administrative or supervisory employees of the Department
21 as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary
22 are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons
23 making affidavits required by this section, and they shall
24 charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further,* That any
25 person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization

1 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
2 United States by force or violence and accepts employment
3 the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropria-
4 tion contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,
5 upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or
6 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
7 *further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition
8 to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of exist-
9 ing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section
10 shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person
11 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency
12 work involving the loss of human life or destruction of
13 property, and payment of salary or wages may be made
14 to such persons from applicable appropriations for services
15 rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit
16 contemplated by this section.

17 SEC. 8. If at any time during the fiscal year 1945 the
18 termination of the Act entitled "An Act to provide temporary
19 additional compensation for employees in the Postal Serv-
20 ice", approved April 9, 1943, or of the Act entitled "An
21 Act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation
22 to Government employees, and for other purposes", ap-
23 proved May 7, 1943, shall be fixed by concurrent resolution
24 of the Congress at a date earlier than June 30, 1945, the
25 appropriations contained in this Act shall cease to be avail-

able on such earlier date for obligation for the purposes of the terminated Act and the unobligated portions of appropriations allocated for the purposes of such terminated Act shall not be obligated for any other purposes of the appropriation during the fiscal year 1945.

SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945".

INDEX

	Page
Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Bureau of	41
Agricultural Economics, Bureau of	10
Agricultural Research Administration	16
Animal Industry, Bureau of	20
Beltsville Research Center	44
Commodity Credit Corporation	59
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	61
Dairy Industry, Bureau of	26
Emergency rubber project	56
Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Bureau of	33
Experiment Stations, Office of	17
Extension Service	15
Farm Credit Administration	78
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans	81
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	82
Farm tenancy	75
Federal crop insurance	65
Foreign Agricultural Relations	14
Forest roads and trails	56
Forest Service	45
General provisions	83
Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Bureau of	43
Information, Office of	5
International Production Control Committees	14
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	69
Library	9
Marketing service	69
Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, Bureau of	27
Printing and binding	7
Rural Electrification Administration	77
Secretary of Agriculture, Office of	2
Soil Conservation Service	66
Solicitor, Office of	4
Special research fund, Department of Agriculture	16
Submarginal land, retirement of	69
Sugar Act	69
War Food Administration	57
White pine blister rust	44

Union Calendar No. 425

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

[Report No. 1271]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TARVER

MARCH 21, 1944

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Office of Budget and Finance 78th-2nd, No. 53
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued March 23, 1944, for actions of Wednesday, March 22, 1944)

(For the staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

A.A.A.....2
Adjournment.....22
Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations.....1,9
Banking and currency.7,13
Committee assignments8,21
Crop insurance.....12
Electrification.....18
Feed imports.....10
Flood control..5,14,28,30
Food distribution...26,34
Foreign relief.....3
Forestry.....11
Irrigation.....4,8
Labor.....17,33
Machinery, farm.....3,20
Manpower mobilization..17
Personnel.....15
Post-war planning...21,32
Price control....19,24,29
Priorities.....27
Property disposition...35
Production management...6
Puerto Rico.....16
Rationing.....2,25
Sugar.....16
Tennessee Valley Authority.....9
Transportation.....4,23
Veterans.....31

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Began general debate on this bill, H.R. 4443, (pp. 2977-90). Rep. Tarver, Ga., discussed the provisions of the bill (pp. 2977-83), and spoke favoring restoration of CCC's capital (p. 2983). Rep. Plumley, Vt., commended the work of Drs. Auchter (ARA), Reed (BDI), and Bennett (SCS) (pp. 2984-5). Rep. Murray, Wis., criticized and inserted tables showing, the cost of AAA payments but stated that Congress should "not blame the administration of the A.A.A. for something that is a provision of law that we each year sanction by legislation" (pp. 2985-90); Rep. Rizley, Okla., discussed with him WFA's authority "to determine who is entitled to a draft deferment as an essential farmer" and "who shall be entitled to a quota of farm machinery" and Rep. Murray criticized a War-Meat-Board slaughtering order and WFA's reply to his query on this subject (p. 2990).

2. A.A.A.; GASOLINE RATIONING. Rep. Springer, Ind., criticized the AAA cards sent to farmers, questioning the policy of a statement included therein that "A recent ruling provides that future nonhighway gasoline allotments will be based on your completing this farm plan" (p. 2946).

3. FOREIGN RELIEF. Agreed, 285-58, to the conference report on H.J.Res. 192, providing for U.S. participation in UNRRA (pp. 2969-76). This measure will now be sent to the President. Rep. Johsnon, Ill., criticized and inserted tables showing the amount of the planned foreign farm machinery distribution program (pp. 2969-72).

4. TRANSPORTATION; IRRIGATION. Passed, 213-46, with amendments, H.R. 3961, the rivers and harbors bill (pp. 2951-69). Agreed to Rep. Mansfield's committee amendment providing that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands irrigated by the Central Valley Project after rejecting Rep. Voorhis' (Calif.) modifying amendment (pp. 2962-4). Re-

jected, 48-77, an amendment by Rep. Robinson (Utah) providing that the waters of the Western States shall not be used in any way to interfere with domestic use, irrigation, mining, or industrial use whenever established under State law (pp. 2951-7), and an amendment by Rep. Barrett (Wyo.) to strike out all reference to the Missouri River (pp. 2957-60). Rep. Barrett inserted his correspondence with the War Department on the Missouri River project (pp. 2957-60).

5. FLOOD CONTROL. Received the War Department's flood control survey report on the Miss. River between Cairo, Ill., and Baton Rouge, La. (H.Doc. 509). To Flood Control Committee. (p. 3003.)

6. PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT. Received WPB's 10th report of operations (p. 3003).

7. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Smith, Ohio, discussed the "united and associated nations stabilization fund" plan (pp. 2990-3003).

8. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Accepted Rep. Outland's (Calif.) resignation from the Irrigation and Reclamation, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, Territories, and Indian Affairs Committees (p. 2951).

SENATE

9. INDEDPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL. Continued debate on this bill, H.R. 4070 (pp. 2919-29, 2930-9, 2940-3). Sens. Hill, Ala., McKellar, Tenn., and others discussed TVA, and Sen. Aiken, Vt., commended TVA's fertilizer and power activities (pp. 2940-1).

10. FEED IMPORTS. Passed as reported H.R. 4410, after agreeing to the committee amendment to permit duty-free imports of oats for human consumption which was attached to the bill as reported by the Finance Committee earlier in the day (S. Rept. 765) (pp. 2914, 2929-30). As passed, this bill extends for an additional 90 days (until June 20, 1944) the period during which wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, cottonseed, corn, or hay, or their products may be imported duty-free for use as livestock or poultry feed; and permits duty-free imports of flaxseed and oats for human consumption during this period. Later the House concurred in the Senate amendment (p. 2976). This bill will now be sent to the President.

11. FORESTRY. Concurred in House amendments to S. 250, the sustained-yield forest-management bill (p. 2933). (For provisions see Digest 52.) This bill will now be sent to the President.

12. CROP INSURANCE. Sen. Langer, N.Dak., inserted Ward Co. (N.Dak.) Agricultural Conservation Assns. resolutions favoring a nation-wide crop insurance corporation (pp. 2913-4).

13. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Sen. Capper, Kans., discussed S. 1642, to amend the Federal Reserve Act, so as to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits, and inserted a Kansas Bankers Assn. resolution and statement opposing this bill (pp. 2912-3).

14. FLOOD CONTROL. Received a Vt. Legislature resolution favoring H.R. 4179, to repeal the provision of the Federal flood control law authorizing the Secretary of War to carry out flood-control projects without the prior consent and

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day and close not later than 3 p. m. on tomorrow, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, I hope as many members of the Committee of the Whole as can do so remain during the attempt on my part to present as briefly as I may the facts about this bill.

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations began its hearings on the 7th day of February and since that time has been engaged almost continuously in morning and afternoon sessions in the completion of hearings on the bill which, as you will observe from examining them, are of a rather voluminous character, and in the work of writing up the bill we are anxious to to have you understand as clearly as possible the reasons which have actuated us in taking certain actions in connection with the formulation of the bill, especially those which have been taken either in reduction or in the increase of Budget estimates. The bill, in our judgment, will prove a less fruitful source of controversy than has any agricultural appropriation bill presented to this House durin the last several years.

The subcommittee is practically in unanimous agreement. Of course, there are some items in the bill concerning which we were not able to reach entire agreement on the part of all members of the subcommittee, but the subcommittee is more nearly in unanimous agreement regarding the provisions of this bill than it has been in regard to any agricultural appropriation bill presented to this House since I have served as a member of the subcommittee.

I desire at this time to express the very deep appreciation which I feel for the fine spirit shown by all members of the subcommittee, including the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is also a member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WENE], the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who have been so cooperative in connection with the preparation of the bill and for the very large amount of work faithfully performed, which has been necessary on the part of all of them in its preparation.

We have, of course, had the assistance of one of the most able employees of the House Committee on Appropriations who, throughout many years of service, has demonstrated his extraordinary efficiency and who has perhaps had more to do with the preparation of the bill than has any individual member of the subcommittee. I refer, of course, to our genial clerk, Mr. Arthur Orr.

I wish to point out in the beginning of my remarks, as shown by the summary contained on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, that this bill has been more drastically reduced below the level of the appropriation act for the Department for which it provides for the current fiscal year than has been any supply bill presented so far during this session of the Congress for any of the departments of the Government. That statement was made also last year in comparing the bill for this fiscal year with that for the fiscal year 1943. It was true then, as it is now.

We have here, therefore, a bill which, when all of its provisions are taken into accoount, carries about 45 percent less in the way of actual money than was carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year 1944. In making that statement I am taking into consideration the appropriations and reappropriations and loan funds authorized for use in the bills for the 2 fiscal years.

If we take into consideration only appropriations and reappropriations, the amount of the reduction below the funds made available for these items for the present fiscal year is approximately 41 percent, but when consideration of the loan provisions is added the amount of the reduction is 45 percent.

The bill as presented to you here is $93,500,000-plus below budget estimates. It is approximately $404,000,000 below the amount carried in the bill for the present fiscal year for appropriations and for reappropriations, which amount was approximately $972,000,000. When, as I have said, you take into account the reduction of loan authorizations carried in the bill, in addition to this tremendous reduction in appropriations and reappropriations, you have a still further reduction in the amount made available of $82,500,000, which brings the present bill to only 55 percent of the bill for the current fiscal year, involving a reduction of 45 percent.

You may think it strange that I, as one who is deeply interested in agriculture and in contributing to the solution of the problems of agriculture, insofar as it can be done by the appropriation of money for the support of the Department of Agriculture, am thus stressing the fact that by action of the subcommittee on which I serve as chairman there has been such a tremendous reduction in the amount of Federal funds made available for agricultural purposes. I want to assure you that not only myself, but every member of the subcommittee, while we have been interested in bringing about all reasonable economies, have at the same time endeavored to have the bill, insofar as we could under the limitations under which we labored, provide as fully as possible for the reasonable needs of agriculture insofar as those needs could be supplied through the agricultural appropriation bill.

Perhaps the farmer has been requested, through the submission of this bill in its drastically curtailed form to assume more than a fair share of the reduction in national expenditures, and to be deprived of services which, in many instances, are of a type which are desirable if not essential, in the making of proper provision for the needs of agriculture in this time of emergency.

We have not thought, however, to so severely reduce appropriations for the Department of Agriculture as to bring about the reduction or elimination of any absolutely essential activity. We have believed that the farmers of the country generally would approve our efforts to effect all reasonable economies and in that position we have been supported by the evidence of officials of the American Farm Bureau who appeared before our subcommittee, this having been the only farm organization which requested the opportunity to appear and be heard. Of course, there are certain subject matters we could not consider. We have no power to include anything in the bill for the school-lunch program, for which provision was made in the bill for the present fiscal year in the amount of $50,000,000, which was transferred from section 32 funds intended to be used in facilitating the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities. That provision was legislative. Under the rules of the House we are prohibited from bringing in any provision in this bill which would be subject to a point of order as being legislative in character. The same statement applies to the appropriations and loan authorizations which were proposed by the Budget for the Farm Security Administration, amounting to $126,000,000.

There are at least some members on the subcommittee, including myself, who would like to have seen adequate provision made for the continuance of the work of the Farm Security Administration. Certainly there must be provision made for conserving the huge investment of Government funds, amounting to over $400,000,000, which have already been invested in this program. It is absolutely inconceivable that the Congress should fail to make any provision for Farm Security Administration activities and simply leave the matter of the collection and conservation of those funds up in the air,

with the Government's interests unattended to. So, I apprehend that before this bill is finally enacted by the Congress some provision will be found in the bill to take care of this situation, certainly for the conservation of these funds, and I trust for the carrying on in a reasonable way of the activities of the Farm Security Administration for another fiscal year.

We are all familiar with the fact that there has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture a bill that seeks to revise this program and to authorize it, and to combine it with the program of the Emergency Crop Loan and of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Of course, I do not know what action will be taken by the Congress on that proposed legislation.

If the Congress desires to enact a law under which these activities are taken care of, then I trust that it will do so before this bill is finally enacted, so that an appropriation under the terms of whatever law it may enact may be included in the bill. If it does not enact such a law, then I certainly trust that the Senate in its consideration of the bill, not being bound by the same rules which obtain in the House, will insert adequate provision for the Farm Security Administration activities.

I wish also to point out in connection with the remarks I have made concerning the drastic reduction in the appropriations carried in the bill the fact that $170,000,000-plus of this reduction is accounted for by the omission from this bill of any provision for parity payments. We carried, of course, in the bill for the current fiscal year a provision for parity payments on the 1942 crops to carry out an obligation which had been assumed by the Congress in connection with the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943. At this time it appears that all of the major crops to which parity payments would be applicable are selling at or above parity according to parity standards fixed by law, with perhaps one or two exceptions where the prices are almost to parity. Therefore, no provision has been made in this bill for parity payments, and that accounts for a considerable part of the reduction in the over-all appropriations carried in the bill.

There is also the reduction in loan funds for the farm-tenant program of $15,000,000.

Even with these last-mentioned items which were included in the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1944—and have not been included in the present bill—not taken into account, there is still a tremendous reduction in the funds carried in this bill for direct appropriations, reappropriations, and loans as compared with the act for the present fiscal year, amount to $152,921,695.

In addition to appropriations, reappropriations, and loan authorizations, there are, of course, available to the Department of Agriculture certain trust funds estimated to amount, for the next fiscal year, to $10,144,950 and certain funds derived from permanent appropriations, amounting in the aggregate to $125,309,615 making a total of funds for the Department of Agriculture for the 1945 fiscal year of $843,759,959, if the recommendations of this subcommittee, as outlined in the pending bill, are approved by the Congress, as against a total of all similar items for the present year of $1,089,624,558.

I shall not have the time, nor would you have the patience to listen to me for the time that might be necessary, to discuss all of the provisions of this bill. I do ask you to turn with me to the tabular statement which is set out on page 20 of the committee report and the following pages, and I shall make some brief reference to the outstanding items in regard to which the committee has undertaken to effect some changes, either to increase or to decrease Budget estimates.

SECRETARY'S OFFICE AND OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Certain items for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor were increased by small amounts, in the one case $29,200 and in the other case $125,200, largely because of the fact that with the reduction in the working funds of the Department, contemplated by the appropriations made later on in the bill, the work of the Office of the Secretary and of the Solicitor's office ought to be materially decreased. In addition to that, as far as the Office of the Secretary is concerned, there has been set up in the Department, as you know, the Office of the War Food Administrator, which has charge of most of the organizations of the department, and administrative supervision over them, and that fact should bring about a reduction in the work of the Secretary's office.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

While the committee has approved the Budget estimates for the Office of Information, they represent a reduction of $284,524 below funds available for the present fiscal year. The services of that Office, its publications, and the information it is able to furnish the farmers of the requirements of the food-for-victory this time when the American farmer is exerting himself to the utmost to meet the requirements of the food for victory program. The committee has reluctantly approved the contemplated economies in this Office but hopes that the funds carried in the bill will enable it to function with reasonable efficiency.

LIBRARY

The bill carries for the library of the Department $543,233 which is identical with the amount provided in the 1944 act.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

There is some difference of opinion among the members of the subcommittee as to whether it is wise at this time to make further reductions in the funds appropriated for this bureau. Its economic investigations, if properly conducted, are of vital importance to American agriculture. Speaking for myself alone, I feel that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, while the information it furnishes should, of course, be accurate, is supposed primarily to be working for the benefit of agriculture and of the farmer and that too much of its effort has been devoted to an attempt to prove that the condition of the farmer is satisfactory, and that he is being accorded a fair deal in comparison with other classes of our people in the pending emergency. I do not believe that such findings and contentions accurately or fairly present the farmers' case. While prices of agricultural commodities have increased, their increase has been by no means proportionate to the increases in the values of manufactured goods or in the value of services either in war industry or in other civilian employment. While labor in war industry is receiving approximately 200 percent of what it received in World War No. 1, the farmers' prices are very substantially less in value than they were during that war and his labor machinery and fertilizer costs are largely in excess of those which then prevailed. Profits in industry, which are so tremendous as to be in large part responsible for a national income exceeding anything of which anyone ever dreamed in our national history, have not been accompanied by anything like proportionate profits in agriculture.

The farmer is, therefore, justified in feeling that he is not receiving the consideration which is the lot of many classes of our citizenry. If this be the fact, and I think it is, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, supposed to be working for the farmer, has not adequately developed it, and I, therefore, feel that it has not been wholeheartedly the servant of agriculture as it should have been. Perhaps the committee would feel justified in increasing rather than decreasing the amount of its appropriation for economic investigations if it were able to feel that in this field the Bureau is accomplishing to the full and with wholehearted sincerity the type of work which it was set up to do.

The appropriation for its crop and livestock estimates has been approved as submitted by the Budget.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The appropriation carried for the activities of this office is identical with that for the present fiscal year and with the Budget estimate.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Budget estimates for the Office of the Administrator have been approved without change, including the appropriation of $1,226,364 for the special research fund.

EXTENSION SERVICE AND OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

We have been carrying, as you know, in every bill for the last several years a lump-sum appropriation for the Extension Service, $255,000, and for the Office of Experiment Stations, of $63,708, for the purpose of preventing any States from receiving a smaller allotment of funds than they had received prior to the 1940 farm census. These supplemental appropriations have not been authorized by law, and heretofore we could not include them in the bill, under the rules of the House, but this year we are proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, reached yesterday, by which the House may consider as in order any items

carried in the bill which are proposed for authorization under the Pace bill, which passed the House March 7, 1944, just as if that bill had finally been enacted into law, and the making of these two supplemental appropriations is proposed for authorization by the terms of the Pace bill. Therefore, under the rules and the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are proceeding, these two items are in order, and since the House has on several other occasions manifested its purpose to continue the appropriation of these funds, the subcommittee has included provision for them in the pending bill. Other estimates for these organizations have been approved without change.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY (A. R. A.)

A very controversial subject matter is involved in the reduction which has been made in the estimates for the Bureau of Animal Industry, and there has been, as I presume all of you know, an organized campaign upon the part of friends of the field service in the Bureau of Animal Industry to have approval given to the proposed reclassification of 2,472 of these field employees, the effect of which would be to bring about a salary increase of an average of $289 for each of these employees.

I say to you frankly that many arguments which in my judgment have merit, were presented to the subcommittee in favor of the proposed increase in salaries, which is what it amounts to, in fact. Except for the circumstances under which the matter came to the attention of the committee, the committee might have felt inclined to have gone along with the suggestion, but we find ourselves confronted with these facts. All Federal employees have had increases in pay under the provisions of the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, amounting for these particular employees to an average of $452 per employee. We felt that if the Congress should at this time provide for an additional increase through the reclassification method, for all of these field employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, we would start a movement on the part of many organizations of Federal employees to secure for themselves similar consideration. In fact there was proposed in connection with the legislative appropriation bill passed by the House a few days ago by the subcommittee reporting the bill, an increase of $330,000 to provide for an increase in the salaries of the law clerks in the district and circuit court judges' offices, and in the full committee that proposed increase was stricken because the committee did not want to embark on an increase in salaries beyond the 21.6 percent carried by the Overtime Pay Act. So this subcommittee handling the present bill in an effort to be consistent with the action of the committee on the legislative appropriation bill, has eliminated from the estimates here approximately $996,000, which would have been necessary for the next fiscal year to have paid these increases in salaries, and in addition has found it possible to reappropriate $343,000 which had been appropriated for the present fiscal year for the work of eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease, and which it had been proposed to use to increase these salaries for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

That money will not be expended during the present fiscal year, unless the Congress should express its approval of this reclassification plan. In the event it should do that, it would be spent, and that would mean an increase in this appropriation of not $996,000 in all but of $966,000 plus $343,000, which would have to be added to the figures contained in the bill since we would not have that money to reappropriate for the next fiscal year and could not by that process reduce the estimate for the Bureau of Animal Industry.

I trust this may satisfactorily explain the present status of this proposed plan. I apprehend that the matter will be brought to your attention in reading the bill under the 5-minute rule. A motion was made in the whole Committee on Appropriations to restore these cuts that we had made from the Budget estimates for this particular purpose, and that motion was rejected by the full committee by a vote of 19 to 4. It is the hope, at least of a majority of the subcommittee, that the House may approve the action of the subcommittee with regard to this item.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this Bureau which are identical with the appropriations for the present fiscal year have been approved without change.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this Bureau with its manifold activities, including agricultural engineering investigations, cereal crops and diseases, cotton and other fiber crops and diseases, dry-land agriculture, forage crops and diseases, forest pathology, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases, irrigation agriculture, plant exploration, soil and fertilizer investigations, the plant industry experiment farm, soil surveys, sugar-plant investigation, and tobacco investigations, represent in almost every instance small reductions below the amounts carried in the act for the present fiscal year.

We have approved the Budget estimates with two exceptions, having made a small additional appropriation of $3,110 in connection with the investigation of fruit and vegetable crops and diseases, and a reduction of soil-survey item of $12,000, feeling that additional soil surveys at this time are unlikely to prove beneficial in the war effort and especially that these should not be undertaken until it is possible to make available for the use of farmers the information which has already been collected by previous surveys, a great deal of which has not yet been published.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this very important Bureau include provisions for research in fruit insects, Japanese beetle control, sweetpotato weevil control, Mexican fruitfly control, citrus canker eradication, gypsy and brown-tailed moth control, Dutch elm disease eradication, phony peach and peach mosaic eradication, forest insects, truck crop and garden insects, cereal and forage insects, barberry eradication, cotton insects, pink bollworm and thurberia control, bee culture, insects affecting man and animals, insect pest survey and identification, and foreign parasites.

Numerous budgetary reductions in this multitude of items have been approved, although we feel that sufficient funds are now carried in the bill for these worthy purposes to insure the efficient continuance of proper research and investigation. In only one instance have we exceeded Budget estimate. We have restored a proposed budgetary cut of $6,950 in the item for bee culture.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY (A. R. A.)

The committee examined with a great deal of care witnesses having knowledge of the types of investigations being carried on by this Bureau and were particularly interested in the work of the four regional research laboratories. Many substantial accomplishments were reported in connection with that work and the attention of interested Members is respectfully invited to the hearings regarding these subject matters.

In the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry there has been an increase of $18,536 for the purpose of carrying on some very essential work at Winter Haven laboratory in Florida in connection with the experimentation on processes for the preservation of citrus fruit juices so as to aid in shipment abroad for the use of our armed forces and our allies without damage in shipment. We were given advices as to considerable losses which have been sustained by reason of the spoilage of such products in shipment heretofore. The laboratory at Winter Haven has been doing some very important and to some extent at least, successful work in undertaking to solve these particular problems.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

I am sure all the Members of the House are deeply interested in the work of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics which heretofore has been known as the Bureau of Home Economics. It is the women's organization of the Department of Agriculture. Frequently we have letters from women throughout the country complaining that whereas we appropriate $17,000,000 or $18,000,000 for the Bureau of Animal Industry, yet for this organization which has to do with the problems of the American home and homemaking we appropriate what seems to them to be a miserly sum, estimated by the Budget for the next fiscal year at $606,000. I hope you will find time to read the hearings on this bill, and particularly the evidence of the outstanding women from all over the United States who came before our committee to testify in behalf of increases in the Budget estimates for this Bureau. They asked for $675,000 more, which would have more than doubled the amount of the appropriation. The committee was very sympathetic with their request, but felt that under the present

conditions we were not justified in granting it to the full extent that was desired. Bu we have provided here in this bill for an increase in appropriations for this Bureau above the estimates for the next fiscal year of $200,000 for certain very desirable types of research activities which you will find outlined in the committee report and in the hearings.

BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER (A. R. A.)

The Budget estimate for administrative expenses of the Beltsville Research Center has been approved without change. Most of the moneys expended at Beltsville, as Members of the Congress know, are appropriated to the several bureaus of the Department doing work there, and the comparatively small item of $130,760 carried in the bill represents only over-all administrative expenses.

WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

The Budget estimate for this very important work has been approved as submitted in the amount of $2,264,026.

FOREST SERVICE

Despite the fact that two small increases were made in items of appropriations for the Forest Service above Budget estimates, the bill represents a reduction of $2,422,324 below Budget estimates for this Service. This is occasioned by the fact that estimates for forest fire cooperation were in the amount of $5,000,000, whereas the limit of authorization of existing law is $2,500,000, to which we have added $29,062 authorized under the Overtime Pay Act of 1943. This action does not represent the viewpoint of the committee as to what funds should be appropriated for this purpose, but represents the limit of our authority under the law, and the committee leaves open the question of further consideration should the additional amount of the Budget estimate be added to the bill by Senate amendment. We have made an addition under the item for Forest Management of $45,000 which includes $35,000 for use in investigation of Naval Stores Production at the Olustee, Fla., laboratory, and $10,000 for studies looking to the control of the spruce budworm.

The bill includes no money for the acquisition of lands for national forests excepting small amount to carry out existing obligations of the Government under contracts heretofore executed. The available funds for farm and other private forestry cooperation is continued, $781,466, as estimated for by the Budget.

The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has been provided for in the amount of the Budget estimate plus $15,000 for investigations at the Southern Forest Experimental Station at New Orleans, La., in connection with the utilization of southern hardwoods.

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

We have provided in the bill for the liquidation of the emergency rubber project. That, I know, is a subject matter which is bound to arouse considerable discussion and considerable controversy. Before the Members of the House reach the conclusion that the committee has improvidently made provision for the liquidation of this project, I respectfully request that they read the hearings had before the committee with reference to the matter. The Government has expended so far approximately $45,000,000 in connection with this emergency rubber project, most of it in experimentations in guayule, in which so far there have resulted approximately 400 tons of rubber produced from stock which had matured prior to the purchase of the lands comprising the original project by the Government. The golden rod and Russian dandelion and cryptostegia investigations have produced some findings which appear to be of interest, but at the same time there has not been developed from them or from the guayule experimentations any hope that as the result of the carrying on of this project any material relief will be secured in our rubber situation during the period of this emergency unless it should last much longer than most of us hope will be the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

According to the evidence of some of the witnesses who have appeared in past hearings in connection with this emergency rubber project, the cost of the production of this guayule rubber would run about $3 a pound, whereas some of the more recent evidence and that delivered in connection with our hearing this year, would indicate the possibility of its production at 52 cents per pound, or even, according to the most optimistic estimates, at lower prices than that. However that may be, the evidence is undisputed that in 1933 and 1934 natural rubber imported into this country from the East Indies was selling at 3 cents per pound. Of course, that was the lowest price ever reached. But there is no hope in the minds of anyone so far as I have been able to ascertain, that is, anyone who is in position to know or to express an intelligent opinion regarding this subject matter, that we will be able to develop in this country an industry for the production of natural rubber, either from guayule, golden rod, Russian dandelion, or cryptostegia, which will be able to compete with the importation of natural rubber from foreign sources after this war is over and since it is very apparent that the carrying on of this emergency rubber project during the period of the war will not contribute substantially to the solution of our rubber problem, and since it involves and has involved such a tremendous sum of money, the committee has thought proper to provide for its liquidation. However, an ample sum amounting to $3,900,000-plus has been provided in the bill for the purpose of liquidation which would include money for the processing of whatever guayule or other plants they may have which are available for processing during the next fiscal year and the reclamation of whatever rubber can be secured by this processing, which they estimate will be, however, only about 325 tons.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman know of any expenditure for any other agricultural program such as hemp? I do not believe it has been included in the agricultural appropriation, but has there been a wartime experiment on the production of such fibers?

Mr. TARVER. There has been, of course, such a program, but it is not provided for in this bill, and I have not given the study to that particular subject matter that would be required in order to intelligently advise the gentleman concerning it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I note in the table under "Farm tenancy, title I," that there is provided $750,000 for personnel.

Mr. TARVER. I am going to discuss that later. Would the gentleman wait until I reach that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I would like to have that cleared up.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TARVER. The Budget estimates for the War Food Administration contemplate a substantial increase, amounting to more than $3,000,000 above amounts available for the present fiscal year. It has been pointed out, however, by officials of the War Food Administration that many of its activities began long after the beginning of this fiscal year, such as the promulgation and enforcement of food distribution orders, and that more money will be required to carry them on for an entire fiscal year than was sufficient for only a portion of a year. It has been felt, however, by a majority of the subcommittee that the $800,000 projected for expenditure in the wage-stabilization project of War Food Administration should not be expended and that this project should be abandoned. It is believed it should be abandoned now rather than to await the beginning of the next fiscal year, when, if this bill is approved, its funds will not be available for that purpose.

The committee has inserted a proviso which would prevent the expenditure of administrative funds to promulgate or enforce any food-distribution order which undertakes to assess the cost of administering such orders against the handlers, distributors, or producers of the product with which they deal. In the cases of dairymen the War Food Administration has begun a practice of making a small assessment of 1½ cents per hundred pounds of milk against handlers or distributors of dairy products for administrative expenses in carrying out these food-distribution orders which assessment is eventually borne by the producer, whether he is a producer only or a producer-distributor. While the assessment is small we believe it is distinctly unfair that any part of administrative expense of the War Food Administration should be assessed against the agricultural producers with whose products it has occasion to deal. We were advised by administrative officials that a considerable additional amount of administrative money should be appropriated for the use of War Food Administration if these assessments are made impossible. Estimates as to the exact

amount of increase thought necessary were in the nature of guesswork and varied from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000. We believe that the increased funds made available for War Food Administration for the next fiscal year, if this bill is approved, should be amply sufficient to take care of any additional costs which may be incurred in this connection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A reduction of $302,000 is proposed in the committee bill in the amount of money appropriated from Corporation funds for administrative purposes. This represents the judgment of a majority of the subcommittee as to economies that it should be possible to effect in the administration of the affairs of the Corporation. It cannot be said that the subcommittee has been in unanimous agreement on this proposed reduction. Further, I as one member of the subcommittee believe that an appropriation should be made by Congress to restore the capital stock of the Corporation as contemplated by law. According to the information we have the capital stock of $100,000,000 has now suffered almost 100 percent impairment. A Budget estimate for approximately $39,000,000, intended to replace a portion of this impairment, was recently disapproved by the Deficiency Subcommittee and the House passed the deficiency bill which might have contained the appropriation without amendment in this particular. There was no Budget estimate before our subcommittee for this purpose, and we did not feel justified in including in this bill any provision with relation to this subject matter. The proviso carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of the present year prohibiting the sale of Government-owned or controlled agricultural commodities at less than parity prices is carried in the pending bill in substantially the same form in which it appears in the present law and with the same exceptions.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

The bill carries provision for the direct appropriation of $290,000,000 as contemplated in the Budget estimates although the Budget estimates provided for the use of $40,000,000 of this amount from section 32 funds. For this use, however, we were unable to provide since it is not authorized by law. We, therefore, appropriate in the bill the $40,000,000 directly, or a total of $290,000,000, which, added to funds which will be available from previous appropriations, will make a total of $300,000,000 available for the program for the present calendar year, which is the amount of the limitation contained in the 1944 Agricultural Appropriation Act. The money is provided entirely for soil-conservation and water-conservation practices. Language in the Budget which would have required that the 1944 appropriation suffice for the program until June 30, 1944, instead of the calendar year 1943 as appropriated has been deleted by the deficiency committee in its submission of the deficiency bill considered a few days ago and similar language proposed by the Budget for the pending bill with regard to extending the availability of the appropriation carried in this bill for a program to end June 30, 1945, instead of for a program to end December 31, 1944, has been disapproved by this committee since we feel that the effect of these proposed changes would be to reduce the appropriation for soil- and water-conservation practices by having the same funds suffice for the needs of the program for a 6-month period after the expiration of the period for which they were pledged.

PARITY PAYMENTS

As previously pointed out, no provision is carried in the bill for parity payments.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Despite the action of the Congress last year in directing the liquidation of the Federal crop insurance program, the budget has sent over an estimate in the amount of $5,997,433 for the reinstallation of this program and carrying it on for another fiscal year. Of course, there has been no insurance on wheat or on cotton, the only two agricultural products involved for the present crop year. The committee is of the opinion that the Congress considered very carefully all of the facts, both for and against this program, in taking the action it did last year and does not believe that it contemplates now reversing its position, and immediately after directing the liquidation of the program, providing for its reinstatement.

I might say to you that the evidence regarding last year's program, what was done after the hearings last year, shows a more unsatisfactory condition with reference to the Federal crop insurance program even than was shown at last year's hearings. The losses on wheat have been $6,000,000 as compared with $3,000,000 the year before. The losses in cotton, while not so considerable, yet have been substantial, and the entire losses for the 5-year period of operation of the Corporation aggregate in excess of $63,000,000. They are divided about half in the amount of indemnities paid by the Government over and above the amount of premiums paid by the farmers, and about half in administrative expenses. I think there is no member of the committee but who is sympathetically interested in the objective sought by the establishment of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I think all of them without exception, would have been delighted if that experiment had been successful.

But, 5 years' operation with huge losses to the Government seems to have demonstrated conclusively that the plan, as devised by Congress, will not work out, and the farmers themselves are not participating in it to the extent which had been anticipated. Last year only one-fourth of the wheat farmers participated, whereas one-third had participated the year before. The same is true of cotton where 10 percent or less have participated. So under those circumstances we thought it would be unwise to provide, and we did not think that Congress would be willing to provide, for the reinstallation of the program for the next fiscal year. For that reason we omitted this Budget estimate, but have provided for an appropriation of $100,000 from the unexpended balance heretofore appropriated for this Corporation, to be used in the final and complete liquidation of the Corporation during the early part of the next fiscal year. We feel that that amount of money should be amply sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I cannot understand why the Budget would make that recommendation after the action of the Congress.

Mr. TARVER. I am not able to inform the gentleman on that point.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service, in my judgment, is performing a more useful service for agriculture than any other organization of the Department of Agriculture.

I have had the opportunity to examine its work in connection with soil conservation districts set up in my own State, to which, as to other districts throughout the country, it furnishes technical assistance and assistance in the making of farm plans and otherwise. The result of its work, to one who will take the trouble to examine it, is astounding. It has contributed not only to the restoration of the soil where it has been depleted, but it has contributed, in substantial ways, to the material prosperity of the farmers who have undertaken to cooperate with the Soil Conservation Service in this work, and I feel amply justified in the statement I made a few moments ago to the effect that the Soil Conservation Service is performing a work of more benefit to agriculture than is any other organization in the Department of Agriculture.

Since I feel that way about it, you may wonder why I am in accord with the action of the Committee in reducing the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service as estimated for by the Budget, by $2,935,000. $2,900,000 of that was intended for use in connection with the proposed taking over of certain drainage and irrigation districts set up by State laws, in which cases the draining or irrigating in the districts in question, as the case might be, was assessable against the land in those districts. Those districts have proven unsuccessful ventures. Now it is proposed by the Soil Conservation Service to take over these unsuccessful districts and spend several hundred thousand dollars for heavy machinery and equipment, to proceed at Government expense, with some undetermined amount of cooperation on the part of the local owners, to endeavor to carry out the programs which were originally undertaken and with regard to which there was failure.

We thought that suggestion unwise. Despite our love for the Conservation Service, we provided for the elimination of this portion of its estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In regard to that $3,000,000 for drainage in connection with the Soil Conservation Service, was there any evidence presented to the committee that might justify, not the projects but the effort that might be made on individual farms, to do the drainage work in connection with increasing food production?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. There was evidence submitted to the committee that some of this land lying on the Mississippi River, I think part of it in Illinois, and in some of the Middle Western States would, if reclaimed, be extremely valuable land, perhaps worth two or three hundred dollars an acre. In the opinion of the officials of the Soil Conservation Service there is a need for the development of additional land for agricultural production at this time. The committee was of the opinion, however, that the trouble about agricultural production today is not that we have insufficient land upon which adequate production might be obtained, but that we do not have the necessary farm machinery and labor and other facilities which would bring about adequate production. We thought that instead of using several hundred thousand dollars—I think it approximates a million dollars for heavy machinery and equipment, and with other funds it would amount to $2,900,000, in trying to reclaim this land which other authorities had tried to reclaim without success, we ought to husband our resources for use in trying to do what we could to aid in the agricultural program on lands already available, and which should be sufficient for our purposes if properly handled, and with proper equipment and labor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What the gentleman says may be true of particular lands that may be along the river, but I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would not want to say that applied to all the land. There is no contemplation of using money to buy equipment. As I understand, practically all of these funds are used for personnel.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no. The gentleman is mistaken. If he will examine the justifications he will find that a tremendous amount of the reduction made here was estimated for, for the purpose of purchasing heavy equipment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. For the drainage part.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But practically all of their appropriation goes to personnel, does it not?

Mr. TARVER. No; I would say that the major portion of it goes to personnel, but this particular item has included in it a tremendous amount of money, well over half a million dollars, for heavy equipment.

Now, may I pass on briefly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I find nothing in here that would provide money for the control of chinch bugs and grasshoppers unless it be in this paragraph for the control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases. Does that cover it?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I intend to discuss that further on, but I may as well dispose of it now.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Would the gentleman tell us whether corn borers would be included, too?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; they are included, too; all destructive pests. We have not carried in this bill heretofore the pest-control provision. It has been provided for in the deficiency bill, but $2,700,000 is carried for it in this bill with the understanding that, if there develops need for more money, the money will be supplied through a deficiency appropriation. This was not intended to be the limit of what is to be available for the purpose of combating these outbreaks, if they occur, of pests of these types.

The school-lunch program: I have already referred to this. I am one of those who feel that the school-lunch program in some form ought to be continued. I regret very much that the committee has been unable to make provisions for funds in this bill to provide for the continuance of this program, but we are without authority to do so, for the program is not authorized by law. Had we inserted such provision in the bill, it would have been stricken on a point of order in the House. Further than that, the House on March 7 voted down an amendment to the Pace bill which would have authorized the program, and as I recall, the vote was about 3 to 1. So, the committee being the servant of the House, and feeling on this occasion that the action on the Pace bill was indicative of its opinion regarding the program, its composite opinion, and also because the program is not authorized by law, could not insert the provision in the bill.

EMERGENCY EROSION CONTROL, EVERGLADES REGION, FLORIDA

The budget of $72,248 for this project, which is to be matched by State and local funds, has been approved.

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

The Budget estimate of $1,250,000, representing a decrease of $58,875 below the current appropriation, has been approved. It does not involve the purchase of any additional land but only the caretaking, maintenance, and operation for demonstration purposes of lands already owned by the Government.

SUGAR ACT

The Budget estimate for administration of the Sugar Act has been approved without change.

MARKETING SERVICE

No change has been effected in estimates for the Marketing Service except by the addition of $25,915 intended to restore marketing-news service for Cleveland, Detroit, and Seattle. Small items of increase proposed by the Budget for the various branches of this service are almost in their entirety related to increased cost brought about by the Overtime Pay Act of 1943 and this statement is also true with regard to other increases of a similar character appearing at other points in the bill.

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

These estimates, as I have already stated, have been disapproved since appropriation is not authorized by law. They amount to $126,000,000. When the pending Cooley bill to provide for the consolidation of this activity with the Emergency Crop Production Loan activity and that of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations comes before the House we will be able to ascertain the legislative will as to the type of program of this sort which it is desired to maintain and under what limitations. It is to be hoped that that legislation will have been enacted prior to the final disposition of the pending bill so that provision can then be made in this bill for such appropriations as Congress may see fit to authorize.

FARM TENANT LAND PURCHASE PROGRAM

The Budget estimate for loans for this program in the amount of $15,000,000 has been approved. The program, in my judgment, has amply justified itself and should be expanded after the war. At the present time its activities have necessarily diminished owing to high land values and the apparent unwisdom of permitting tenants to assume long-term obligations to pay for farms at high prices, which obligations they would probably be unable to discharge under post-war conditions. The appropriation of $750,000, or half the Budget estimate, for the administration of this program is, in my judgment, manifestly insufficient, and yet we are prohibited by law from appropriating more than 5 percent of the amount of funds made available, the law having apparently failed to take into account the tremendous amount of money the Government has invested in the loans made in previous years and which must be serviced and collected. I sincerely hope that the Senate may, under its rules, which are more liberal than those of the House, make provision for the additional administrative funds necessary.

LIQUIDATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

No appropriation was proposed by the Budget and none has been made for this purpose. It is proposed that necessary liquidation expenses in 1945 for these projects shall be financed from trust funds received for such purposes from such projects. Their complete liquidation and that of all other cooperative or collective farming activities has been twice directed by Congress, and we are still hopeful that it may be eventually achieved.

WATER FACILITIES—ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

This appropriation was estimated for by the Budget in connection with the estimate for loans, grants, and rehabilitation which has heretofore been discussed.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The budget estimates for the Rural Electrification Administration have been approved without change. The work of this organization during the present fiscal year has substantially improved and with the relaxation of restrictions upon the use of materials in line construction greater steps have been made toward completing the job of rural electrification than were possible in the 1943 fiscal year. It is believed, however, that the amount of funds estimated for by the budget will be amply sufficient for the needs of R. E. A. for fiscal 1945.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Except for $626,321 directly appropriated, which represents a reduction of $62,938 below the appropriation for the present fiscal year, no funds are directly appropriated to the Farm Credit Administration for administrative expenses. The larger portion of these expenses is paid by amounts chargeable against activities administered by it and by transfer from farmers' crop production and harvesting loan funds. Adequate provision for this last-mentioned activity is made through reappropriation of unexpended balances.

FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Provision is made in the bill for the use of corporation funds for its administrative expenses in the amount of budget estimates.

The record of the Farm Credit Administration in its several branches and of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is one which must bring gratification to all of those who are interested in the development of a more stable agriculture and the removal as time goes on of the heavy debt burden with which our farmers generally have been afflicted. An examination of the hearings will disclose the repayment of these loans has exceeded all previous records and, while the loan activities of the Federal land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are being materially reduced, that circumstance in itself very greatly adds to our feeling of satisfaction with the success of these activities.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, I have substantially covered the major items in the bill. The hour is growing late, and unless some Member desires to ask me a question I shall relinquish the floor.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I have some curiosity to know whether a worm is an insect.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, undoubtedly it is. An insect is not necessarily a worm, but a worm, of course, is an insect.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I spoke about corn borers. That would be covered by the provision at the bottom of page 40 and the top of page 41 of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. One further inquiry, if the gentleman will permit, about farm loans upon grain that is stored upon the farms. That is taken care of by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TARVER. If it is taken care of at all it is taken care of there. I want to say this to the gentleman with regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation: I think it was a mistake when the House in the deficiency bill made no provision for a restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation which has now been depleted by at least 95 percent of the original $100,000,000. Whether the Commodity Credit Corporation will continue to be able to make as extensive loans during the coming fiscal year as it has in the past is very questionable because of this depletion in its working capital. Certainly I think the Congress ought to provide sufficient funds, but all we can do in this bill is to make an appropriation for its administrative expenses from corporate funds.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I think there has been nothing so satisfactory as the right to the farmer to store his grain on his own farm and borrow money on it. It has been universally approved. I think it ought to be covered in the bill.

Mr. TARVER. There is nothing we can do here except to appropriate funds from the corporate funds for its administrative expenses. The Budget estimate providing for restoration of the capital stock of the Corporation was referred to the deficiency subcommittee, not our subcommittee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the chairman in regard to several items here, especially in regard to farm homes and with regard to forest management. Can the gentleman give me a little more assurance about taking proper care of the great Government investment in the Farm Security Administration so that what we have there will be protected?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will take another minute.

Let me say to the gentleman that it is beyond the power of this committee to include provisions in this bill for taking care of the investments or for carrying on in any degree the activities of the Farm Security Administration. It has never been authorized by law, but certainly I cannot conceive that Congress will fail to make some provision for the protection of the Government's interest in Farm Security Administration loans before the end of the present fiscal year, either through this bill or through some other legislative action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, not long ago I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 418, which provided for the reaffirmance of the action of the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1922, when it placed itself on record as favoring the establishment of a national home in Palestine for the Jews. This original action was in substantiation of the Balfour Declaration, wherein Britain committed itself to the identical policy, and the later mandate of the League of Nations, signed by 72 nations, which entrusted Britain with the encouragement of Jewish immigration into Palestine, their close settlement of its lands, and the establishment there of a Jewish national home. Implicit in the Balfour Declaration and the mandate was the plan that the Jews should eventually form in Palestine a nation or commonwealth. The resolution which I presented provided expressly for a Jewish commonwealth. This policy was at that time likewise agreeable to the Arabs in their first gratitude at being themselves freed from Turkish rule. The resolution of the Sixty-seventh Congress was later fortified by a convention or treaty between the United States and Britain wherein the United States agreed to the mandate, and Britain pledged itself not to change its terms without our consent.

In 1939 the white paper was published by Britain without the consent of the League or of our country, the effect of which was the cutting off of immigration into Palestine and the prohibition of the further purchase by the Jews of Palestine lands. This action was assailed in Britain by many of its most prominent leaders, and was condemned by the mandates commission of the League of Nations. In the meantime, the persecutions of Hitler had grown steadily more brutal and murderous, both in Germany and the conquered countries, until it is doubtful today whether any considerable number of European Jews will survive. It became imperative that a haven be found for those who can now escape, the hope be afforded the others of a post-war asylum. This Palestine resolution sought to fill this desperate need.

We are impelled to the salvation of the Jews by many motives. The first, of course, is common humanity. We cannot be so callus as to be indifferent to the suffering of these unfortunate people. The second is that our treaty rights be respected, and that the judgment of the civilized world at the expiration of the last war be now affirmed. The third is our concern for the world's stability and peace. For centuries the Jewish minority has been mistreated by Christian Europe. Anti-Semitism has been repeatedly used as a weapon by ambitious and demagogic tyrants. Palestine is the answer to these grave, recurring problems of the world.

Our President has stated but recently that America has never agreed to the white paper, but favors immigration of Jews into Palestine. He pledged eventual justice to the downtrodden Jews of the world.

At a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House last week a letter from Secretary of War Stimson was received, stating that further action on the

Palestine resolution at the present time would be prejudicial to the successful prosecution of the war. A representative of the War Department stated in the committee's executive session matters of a military nature which concerned themselves with the possible unfortunate results of the present passage of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we are not soldiers but civilians. We are not military strategists. We must in the absence of superior knowledge respect our selected military chiefs in their decisions on military matters. The progress of the war and its successful conclusion is never absent from our minds. Our thoughts are grave when they turn upon the safety of our own American boys in the armed services. We cannot lightly disregard the warning we have received.

On the other hand, we have not abandoned this fight. We have agreed in committee, and have so stated, that we will postpone action on this resolution. We have not tabled it nor buried it. The Jews are entitled by all considerations of humanity and right to their home. We must press for action whenever the military situation is alleviated.

It is my intention so to do as quickly as I have reason to believe that I am not endangering our soldiers nor hampering our military in so doing.

This is my pledge to the House and to the millions who cling to this hope of Palestine as the last chance of salvation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I assent generally to the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on which it is my privilege to have served some time.

Mr. Chairman, the agricultural interests of this country are more fortunate than they perhaps know or appreciate to have as the chairman of this subcommittee so energetic, so able, so fair an advocate, or such a man as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. He is a hard man to "lick" when he has made up his mind he is right; but overwhelmed as he is sometimes by the votes of those whom he still thinks are wrong, he is the best sport in the world. He will report the committee's action and defend it—and I would not do it as such, but he will, and he will reserve the right to express his own opinion on the floor. That is what I call sportsmanship, and I hand it to him. If we "lick" him then and there I will say we are good. It is a pleasure and a great honor to serve with him and with the other members of the committee, none of whom are less distinguished or able than he.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not in the brief period of time that has been allotted to me undertake to cover all the ramifications of the activities of or appropriations for this great Department. I take it for granted that my colleagues on the committee will, if they have not already done so, tell you in detail of the status of the many vast programs that have been launched through the Department of Agriculture at some time during the past 10 or 12 years—such programs as the emergency rubber project, the work of the War Food Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the prosecution of the agricultural program under which vast benefits ranging from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 have been paid annually to the American farmer, and other programs and activities of the like nature.

FOOD WILL WIN THE WAR

These are subjects of primary importance, of course, and it is proper that the House and the country should be advised of them. However, it shall be my pleasure to devote the few remarks which I intend to make on this bill to the subject of agricultural research, that activity to which the Department of Agriculture was born almost 100 years ago and to which it has been dedicated in the act often referred to as the basic act establishing the Department and dedicating it to the acquisition and dissemination of information useful to agriculture in the broadest sense of that term.

That was the work which the Department had been carrying on for almost three-quarters of a century when these great, modern programs involving the control of agricultural production, the payment of benefits to agriculture, and so forth, first appeared on the scene. In fact, it was upon the foundation of knowledge that agricultural research had laid that these programs were established and have been carried on.

I do not hope to be able to cover the entire field of agricultural research in my remarks today. That is a subject upon which one could dwell with profit for many hours. It is a subject shot through and through with romance—the story of the plodding work of thousands upon thousands of scientific men, each working in his little cubicle and in his own generation and each contributing to the sum total of the vast store of scientific knowledge on agricultural subjects which is now the precious heritage of this generation.

There are three men of whose work I know in particular and whom I have come to esteem for their admirable qualities, their ability in research, and for the great contributions which they are making to this great store of knowledge. In naming them I do not wish to detract from the similarly admirable qualities which I know are possessed by the other bureau chiefs, but whom it has not been my good fortune to know as intimately or to observe their work as in the case of these three men.

I am referring to Dr. E. C. Auchter, formerly the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry but now the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration; to Dr. O. E. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Dairy Industry; and to Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service.

In praising them let it be understood that I include, as they would insist, within that praise all of the worthy individuals who labor with them and under their supervision. Also let it be understood that the work which they are doing and to which I am calling special attention merely exemplifies the splendid work being performed by all the scientific men in this great Department under the guidance of their great bureau chiefs.

The war has placed a man killing and most solemn responsibility upon the shoulders of Dr. Auchter, the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration. It has been his duty to redirect and coordinate the research of the several bureaus under his administration with a view to rendering maximum support to the war effort. Dr. Auchter reports that a thorough review of all research projects has resulted in placing about 90 percent of them in the category of being directed toward the solution of problems pertinent to war food, feed, fiber, medicinal, and other requirements. The remaining projects, he tells us, are on a curtailed basis, directed principally to the maintenance of valuable breeding stocks, experimental orchards, groves, and certain physical facilities the complete abandonment of which would entail a loss too great to be justified even by the war.

Let me cite just a few of the recent accomplishments by the men working under Dr. Auchter's supervision:

They have developed methods for preparing and utilizing crude adhesive materials from natural sources for meeting emergency camouflage needs where base supplies are unavailable. The results of these studies have been incorporated into instructions issued by the military services.

They have developed soybean varieties of high yield and high content of oil and of improved drying quality especially valuable for industrial war uses.

Through the application of breeding methods in the improvement of sheep on the western ranges, they have made definite progress in increasing the length of staple and amount of clean wool. During the past 3 years the staple length of the fleeces in the breeding line under the project has increased from 2.17 inches to 2.41 inches, or a little better than 10 percent.

They have discovered that the lack of honeybees and other pollinating insects in Utah is partly responsible for the steady decline in alfalfa seed production. Since the practice of devoting lands to the growing of alfalfa as a part of crop rotation is regarded as of major importance in the soil-conservation program, the value of this discovery becomes obvious.

Experiments on a laboratory scale in the application of certain chemicals to turpentine woods have demonstrated the possibility of stimulating and increasing the flow of rosin-bearing saps by this means, and the present bill contains an increase of $35,000 for the purpose of enlarging these experiments to the pilot-plant scale with a view to the early introduction of this process into the industry and with a view to its availability to increase the production of vitally needed naval stores in connection with the war.

These constitute but a few examples of what has been recently accomplished.

They could be multiplied many hundred times.

I wish now to speak briefly of the interesting and important work being done by the Bureau of Dairy Industry under the immediate supervision of Dr. Reed, the Chief of that Bureau. Here again the improvements are too numerous to be enumerated in their entirety.

Recent accomplishments have been along the line of producing a dehydrated form of cheese which not only enhances the keeping quality of the product but which greatly reduces the bulk and therefore the amount of shipping space required to transport this product which is of such great importance to our allies as well as to our soldiers overseas.

In compiling a roster of the great shipbuilders of this period, the names of Dr. Reed and his associates should not be omitted, for when one has devised a process by which products which once required two ships to carry may now be carried in one, has he not, in effect, constructed a ship?

One of the most interesting pieces of work performed by the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been the direction of the work of the herd-improvement associations. These associations had, in 1927, 327 cows only 15 percent of which produced more than 375 pounds of butterfat per cow per year, while in 1942, with 816 cows on test, 34 percent produced over 375 pounds, and the average last year of all cows in these associations was 339 pounds of fat as compared to an average of 188 pounds for the entire dairy-cow population.

Here indeed is a foundation upon which a dairy industry can be erected in this country far greater than man has ever dreamed of.

The work of Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, is known far and wide not only in this country but throughout the entire world. The Soil Conservation Service had its very humble start in the form of a very small appropriation for soil erosion investigation reported out in this very bill some 15 years ago through the initiative of the Honorable James P. Buchanan, of Texas, then a minority member of the committee but who later became its chairman. This appropriation was continued from year to year with some increases in amount as time went on, and the movement finally blossomed forth in the establishment of a great bureau in this great Department of the Government.

Under the guidance of Dr. Bennett and his inspirational leadership, soil conservation demonstration projects to the number of approximately 150 were established throughout the length and breadth of this great land. Wherever a region had problems common to the great number of farm areas within its boundaries there would be set up a great farm demonstration project of sometimes as many as 25,000 acres. Every farmer in this project agreed to conduct his farm operations under the direction of the Soil Conservation scientists assigned to the project. Crops that had formerly been planted in rows up and down hill, as a result of which heavy rains would wash away great quantities of topsoil, were now planted in rows which followed the contour of the land. The contour rows, instead of facilitating rapid run-off of the rains, tended to hold the precipitation until it sank into the ground where it was stored up for the use of the crops in drier seasons and whereby the precious topsoil was not washed away to the streams and to the rivers and down into the sea where it was beyond recovery.

Farmers for miles around would visit these demonstration projects and would learn of the improved methods and of the increased production resulting from the application of the principles of soil conservation which had been worked out by the men under Dr. Bennett's supervision.

Long after this generation has passed from the scene of action, long after the programs of control of agricultural production have been supplanted by a more satisfactory and a more intelligent regime, the work of the vast army of scientific men who generation after generation have labored upon the problems confronting agriculture and have made of agriculture the greatest and noblest of all the sciences, will go on and each succeeding generation will reap dividend at compound interest on the labors and the efforts which they have so patiently put forth throughout the years.

Recognizing the almost incalculable value of the research work that has been done and is being done this very moment in the fields offered by the sulfa drugs and penicillin, your committee, while reducing the appropriation sought in some respects, has been concerned not to cripple nor to retard unduly the work of those who are giving their lives and effort to the advancement of science for the safety, security, rehabilitation, and prosperity of us all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CONGRESS MUST ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITY IF THEY CONTINUE THESE EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, when the New Deal was verbally buried its follies were not interred with its bones. I am including in my remarks the official table showing the payees that received in 1942 up to $185,000 as Government payments.

Before discussing the import of this information at this time, I wish to bring out certain facts and my own personal observations. First of all, we should consider that when this subsidy program was adopted and up until 1940, farm prices were low, and these Government payments could be accepted and construed as part of the market price rightly belonging to the producer.

Second, from remarks made when this same subject was under consideration in previous years, I wish to emphatically state that I am not necessarily opposing big farms, nor have I any personal feelings against any insurance company or any large land owner or owners. I will say I do not believe in a system that subsidizes one man $20 and another $100,000. I oppose these payments because it does not appear to me to be a desirable expenditure of public funds.

Third, I say right here and now that no Member of Congress who supports the present method of distributing these funds can fairly criticize the A. A. A. I have discussed this question of Government payments with many township, county, and State A. A. A. committeemen. They all have had constructive suggestions as to how to improve the A. A. A. The leadership and plans may or may not have been right when the A. A. A. was inaugurated, but that is no excuse for continuously following the methods of distribution that were then put into effect.

In other words, let us not blame the administration of the A. A. A. for something that is a provision of law that we each year sanction by legislation. The agency has had little criticism for not following the mandates of Congress, so I say frankly that Congress must accept the responsibility if it does not change the legislation.

The A. A. A. has gradually changed its program as much, no doubt, as was permissible under the provisions of the law.

With the foregoing statements I hereby include the table showing the 1942 payments of over $1,000 each by States. It is as follows:

Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs—United States

State	Number of payees	Payments			
		Agricultural conservation program	Parity	Naval stores	Total
Alabama	138	$190,525.53		$57,201.07	$247,726.60
Arizona	390	883,947.59	$34,575.12		918,521.71
Arkansas	763	1,574,831.29	2,625.72		1,577,457.01
California	1,315	2,652,323.53	699,561.93		3,351,885.46
Colorado	418	523,019.36	212,505.10		735,524.46
Connecticut	19	46,054.87	150,478.30		196,533.17
Delaware	25	22,626.80	13,528.67		36,155.47
Florida	251	301,073.41		259,060.83	560,134.24
Georgia	370	303,501.72	5,518.63	428,755.98	737,776.33
Idaho	656	624,996.42	567,661.74		1,192,658.16
Illinois	4,479	2,847,854.34	4,162,991.75		7,010,846.09
Indiana	1,040	705,122.22	971,091.78		1,676,214.00
Iowa	3,892	1,796,915.26	2,804,142.40		4,601,057.66
Kansas	3,225	2,942,989.49	2,436,484.78		5,379,474.27
Kentucky	95	109,188.78	52,243.49		161,432.27
Louisiana	207	412,700.52		2,703.68	415,404.20
Maine	141	82,071.00			82,071.00
Maryland	79	65,500.05	58,087.80		123,587.85

Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs—United States—Continued

State	Number of payees	Payments			
		Agricultural conservation program	Parity	Naval stores	Total
Massachusetts	8	$17,543.05	$84,859.68		$102,402.73
Michigan	26	19,789.17	18,134.95		37,924.12
Minnesota	532	428,940.22	494,656.12		923,596.34
Mississippi	992	2,147,970.97		$20,041.26	2,168,012.23
Missouri	894	839,370.29	716,896.35		1,556,266.64
Montana	1,579	1,505,686.55	1,029,186.63		2,534,873.18
Nebraska	1,552	1,211,134.94	1,361,629.23		2,572,764.17
Nevada	16	30,014.25	3,614.88		33,629.13
New Hampshire					
New Jersey	15	45,182.04	300,006.90		345,188.94
New Mexico	340	572,126.19	99,802.82		671,929.01
New York	18	37,961.74	265,472.95		303,434.69
North Carolina	79	154,454.66	4,508.02		158,962.68
North Dakota	1,121	977,907.28	768,475.55		1,746,382.83
Ohio	688	485,607.89	731,606.72		1,217,214.61
Oklahoma	485	405,378.25	297,490.21		702,868.46
Oregon	926	1,009,210.54	997,657.32		2,006,867.86
Pennsylvania	71	88,454.68	78,937.72		167,392.40
Rhode Island	1	1,074.13			1,074.13
South Carolina	249	387,603.53	6,606.57	12,510.68	406,720.78
South Dakota	658	654,343.66	341,947.50		996,291.16
Tennessee	64	122,385.36	3,975.66		126,361.02
Texas	3,302	4,941,299.45	1,336,846.16		6,278,145.61
Utah	132	148,894.44	96,118.59		245,013.03
Vermont	2	10,494.47	23,656.55		34,151.02
Virginia	21	39,720.41	3,328.37		43,048.78
Washington	1,768	1,570,470.74	1,919,967.36		3,490,438.10
West Virginia	4	4,306.00	366.86		4,672.98
Wisconsin	57	59,224.61	83,581.96		142,806.57
Wyoming	200	299,852.09	49,971.09		349,823.18
Alaska					
Hawaii	18	52,989.23			52,989.23
Puerto Rico	3	4,353.45	918.10		5,271.55
Total	33,324	34,358,986.58	23,291,717.03	780,273.50	58,430,977.11

You will note that one State—Texas—has 10 percent of these large payments and over 10 percent of the total funds. This same year—1942—the Texas cotton farmer on the black waxy land of that State received 19 cents per hour labor return and received 2 cents per hour as Government payment. In 1939, in Dr. Goodsell's study in the United States Department of Agriculture, we find the cotton farmer on this black land received 10 cents per hour labor return and 5 cents, or half of this hourly income, came to him in the form of Government payments. In 1942 there were 178,000 Texas farmers that received less than $20 per farm, or about three millions for soil conservation, while in 1942 there were 3,300 large operations in that State that received $4,941,000 or over $1,400 each for soil conservation alone.

The complete list of these large payments is on file in the office of the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable HAMPTON D. FULMER, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and includes all payments above $1,000, filed according to law by the Secretary of Agriculture with the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. A partial list of the larger payments is as follows:

Alabama:
- E. D. Fennel, Leighton — $10,000
- Stallworth Pine Co., Stapleton — 6,496
- Leonard Premit, Leighton — 4,784

Arizona:
- Arizona Land Co., Waddell — 9,690
- Arizona Farm Products, Casa Grande — 6,381
- Bartlett, Heard Land & Cattle Co., 303 Phoenix Building, Phoenix — 5,830
- Allen Belluzzi, Avondale — 5,238
- V. D. Brown, Sanders — 4,727
- Casa Grande Valley, Casa Grande — 6,176

Arizona—Continued.
- Cataract Livestock Co., Flagstaff — $4,956
- Chandler Implement Co., Chandler — 5,227
- Chinle district, Chinle — 8,632
- Dougherty, M. J., 516 Heard Building, Phoenix — 6,204
- Fort Defiance district, Fort Defense — 9,165
- Peter Ethrington & Sons, Casa Grande — 9,531
- Green Gold Ranchos, Tucson — 9,130
- A. G. King, Buckeye — 8,247
- Klag-E-Toh District, Klagstoh — 9,190
- Leupp District, Leupp — 9,190
- Lukachukai District, Lukachukia — 8,919
- Maricopa Reservoir & Power Co., Phoenix — 9,690
- S. Carl Miller, Buckeye — 5,248
- T. G. Rhodes, Avondale — 7,165

Arkansas:
- Twist Leasing Cooperative Association, Twist — 8,415
- Wilson Lee Co., Wilson — 7,380
- Tillar Mercantile Co., Tiller — 9,760
- R. A. Pickens & Son Co., Pickens — 7,566
- Miller Lumber Co., Marianna — 9,742
- W. P. McGeorge, Pine Bluff — 7,538
- Lowrance Bros., Driver — 9,810
- Lesser-Goldman Co., Walnut Ridge — 8,293
- Mary K. Kuhn, Marion — 11,717
- Howe Lumber Co., Wabash — 8,481
- Cromer Bros., Osceola — 7,599
- Chapman & Dewey Farms Co., Marked Tree — 8,253
- J. O. E. Buck, Jr., Hughes — 7,686

California:
- J. G. Boswell, Corcoran — 11,309
- J. G. Boswell Co., Corcoran — 11,970
- Capital Co., San Francisco — 11,320
- Frank C. Driver, Riverdale — 10,308
- Russell Giffin Co., Mendota — 11,409
- Ralph and Margaret Gilkey, Corcoran — 13,797
- A. W. Goodfellow, Fresno — 14,408
- Grayson-Owen Co., Oakland — 15,417
- J. W. Guiberson Co., Corcoran — 10,798
- Heck Bros., Stratford — 11,119

California—Continued.
- Hotchkiss Estate Co., Firebaugh — $14,080
- C. E. Hanchin, Bakersfield — 12,200
- James Irvine, San Francisco — 12,788
- Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield — 11,666
- Natomas Co., Sacramento — 14,831
- J. E. O'Neill, Fresno — 11,009
- J. C. Phillips, Paso Robles — 11,319
- F. E. Redfern, Dos Palos — 10,950
- Forest Ripley, Corcoran — 11,639
- Sutter Basin Corporation, Ltd., Robbins — 15,960
- Elmer C. Von Glahn, Corcoran — 24,916

Colorado:
- Western Boca County Soil Erosion District, Springfield — 3,101
- C. E. Tupps, Watkins — 4,159
- Ira J. Taylor, Pasoli — 4,074
- Soil Erosion District, Walsh — 4,181
- Reicholt & Beal, Julesburg — 4,201
- R. R. Rutherford, Vilas — 6,911
- San Luis Valley Land & Cattle Co., Crestone — 7,200
- Carl Nielson, Ruggin — 5,094
- A. S. Miller, Watkins — 4,157

Colorado:
- T. P. Klausner, Roggen — 6,800
- Alvin Hobbs, Milliken — 5,060
- Hatchet Cattle Co., Pueblo — 9,178
- B. V. Hanna, Springfield — 5,712
- Frank L. Forristall, Hugo — 4,322
- James A. and Lyle Cocksey, Roggen — 4,477
- Arnold-Harriman Co., Inc., Fowler — 3,465
- Arkansas Valley Sugar Beet & Irrigated Land Co., Holly — 3,619
- American Crystal Sugar Co., Denver — 4,513

Connecticut:
- Aetna Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 52,092
- Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 25,046
- Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 23,172
- Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford — 59,298
- Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., Hartford — 6,888

Delaware:
- 25 payees—only one over $2,500.
- Lillian Price, Middletown — 2,506
- John S. Isaacs, Ellendale — 2,346
- Julius N. Kirk, Middletown — 2,088
- Townsends Inc., Millsboro — 1,909

Florida:
- American Sumatra Tobacco Corporation, Quincy — 6,814
- Avon Florida Citrus Corporation, Avon Park — 6,549
- Aycock-Lindsey Corporation, Shamrock — 9,400
- Dixie Cattlemen's Association, Okeechobee — 5,674
- Hugh Turpentine Co., Maxville — 5,451
- Ideal Holding Co., Perrine — 4,277
- A. B. & D. B. Kibler, Inc., Lakeland — 8,376
- Lykes Bros., Inc., Tampa — 9,740
- Mayo Rosin Co., Shamrock — 7,296
- Palm and Pine Land Co., New York, N. Y. — 6,216
- Seminole Cattle Co., Inc., Orlando — 8,986
- Southern Resin & Chemical Co., Mary — 7,702
- Swainsboro Rosin Corporation, Jacksonville — 6,144
- Welles' Fruit and Livestock Co., Arcadia — 4,296

Georgia:
- Bateman Fruit Farm, Inc., Macon — 7,052
- Brunswick Peninsula Corporation, Brunswick — 9,400
- Butler Naval Stores, Inc., Butler — 5,179
- J. B. Davis & Co., Camilla — 7,176

Georgia—Continued.
- W. M. Jackson, Est., Donovan — $6,980
- Langdale & Bennett, Nashville — 6,514
- Meadows Turpentine Co., Vidalia — 5,325
- Mitchell Naval Stores, Homerville — 6,008
- The Newton Co., Cogdell — 8,664
- Onyx Turpentine Co., Cordele — 6,554
- Tarver Turpentine Co., Valdosta — 9,400

Idaho:
- J. W. Harp, Idaho Falls — 11,951
- Kootenai Valley Farms, Inc., Bonners Ferry — 11,241
- D. H. Linderman, Tetonia — 7,716
- McIntosh & Grover, Lewiston — 7,560
- Joe Rosenkranz, Reubens — 8,217
- Wagner & Co., Clarkston, Wash. — 6,197
- W. T. Wagner, Clarkston, Wash. — 6,556
- Herndon & Harris, Lapwai — 5,397
- Leslie Herndon, Culesac — 5,296
- Joe Lux, Nez Perce — 5,929
- McDonald Bros., Fenn — 4,467
- F. S. Parkinson, Rexburg — 5,456
- Carl Rudeen, Pocatello — 6,404
- Thomas Bros., Downey — 4,231
- Turner Bros., partnership, Nez Perce — 4,515

Illinois:
- Robert Allerton, Monticello — 13,382
- Babson Farms, Inc., DeKalb — 12,813
- Cook Valley Farms, Eldred — 9,075
- M. L. Evans, Sr., Emerson — 12,988
- First Trust Joint Stock Land Bank of Chicago, Chicago — 54,781
- Franklin Life Insurance Co., Springfield — 14,588
- Illinois Bankers Life Assurance Co., Monmouth — 10,509
- Rebecca Lowrie, Galesburg — 13,801
- Mutual Trust Life Insurance Co., Chicago — 11,439
- John C. Proctor, endowment, Peoria — 11,354
- Valley Farms Co., Carrollton — 11,321

Indiana:
- Robert Graham, Washington — 11,655
- Mitchell Partnership, Windfall — 8,071
- New Harmony Realty Corporation, New Harmony — 8,685
- Princeton Farms, Princeton — 10,273
- L. A. Waugh, Brookston — 8,850
- John Brevoort, Vincennes — 7,130
- Deshes Farms, Inc., Vincennes — 6,127
- Fair Oaks Farms, Inc., Chicago — 9,130
- Earl Goodwine, West Lebanon — 7,423
- Frances M. Hanson, Connersville — 6,879

Iowa:
- Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt — 18,758
- Amana Society, Amana — 23,716
- American Mutual Life Insurance Co., Des Moines — 10,753
- Bankers Life Co., Des Moines — 24,954
- Brenton Bros., Inc., Dallas Center — 14,002
- Central Life Assurance Society (mutual), Des Moines — 12,047
- The Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa, Des Moines — 55,269
- Litchfield Realty Co., Des Moines — 11,151
- W. G. Lodwick, Sedan — 10,301
- Martha P. Cresap, Hamburg — 9,983
- Iowa State College, Ames — 5,672
- George Kellogg, Missouri Valley — 8,786
- G. H. Moorhead, Moorhead — 5,965
- National Life Co. (Home Office), Des Moines — 6,638
- Henry K. and Raymond G. Peterson, Council Bluffs — 8,702

Kansas:
- Herbert J. Barr, Leoti — 9,920
- J. W. Baughman, Liberal — 13,321
- R. B. Christy, Scott City — 12,845
- Collingwood Grain and Land Co., Johnson — 19,957
- G. K. Kriss and John Farms, Colby — 13,225
- George E. Gano, Hutchinson — 12,638
- Federal Land Bank, Wichita — 31,558

Kansas—Continued.
- Prudential Investment Co., Topeka — $10,344
- Ed. Richardson, Plains — 10,871
- Siedd Farm Corporation, Lyons — 11,267
- Victory Life Insurance Co., Topeka — 17,362

Kentucky:
- Beaumont Farm, Lexington — 2,486
- Bower Bros., a partnership, Evansville, Ind — 4,950
- Henry P. Barrett, Henderson — 5,075
- James C. Ellis, Owensboro — 3,789
- S. R. Ewing Est., Owensboro — 2,777
- A. G. & S. B. Pritchett, a partnership, Corydon — 2,493
- Charles B. Smith, Reed — 3,667
- Helen Tyler, Hickman — 3,472
- Brent and Co., Inc., Paris — 2,793
- Clarence LeBus and Co., Lexington — 4,668
- Weil Land and Livestock Co., Lexington — 2,880

Louisiana:
- John H. Baker, Delhi — 7,850
- Beene Planting Corporation, Bossier — 5,890
- Burnside and McDonald, Newellton — 6,688
- Canal Bank and Trust Co., New Orleans — 4,207
- T. B. Gilbert and Co., Inc., Wisner — 5,743
- J. W. Lyon, Gilliam — 5,640
- W. H. North, Dixie — 6,320
- W. H. Robinson, Shreveport — 5,859
- A. B. Learned, Natchez, Miss. — 4,067
- A. F. McDade, Sr., McDade — 4,524
- R. R. Rhymes, Rayville — 4,978

Maine:
- W. R. Christie, Presque Isle — 4,196
- Kroemer Farm, Inc., Lagrange — 3,969
- Ben Marks Co., Inc., Presque Isle — 3,991
- Reed Bros., Fort Fairfield — 5,157
- Woodman Potato Co., Presque Isle — 6,930

Maryland:
- J. H. and W. G. Baker, partnership, Buckeystown — 5,096
- Frank S. Dudley, Baltimore — 4,221
- Thomas W. Eliason, Chestertown — 2,448
- Edison Groh, Lime Kiln — 2,337
- Charles Jarrell, estate, Hillsboro — 3,733
- John McKinney, Millington — 2,259
- Oldfields Farm, Galena — 2,182
- Harry H. Rieck, Preston — 2,642
- B. F. Shriver Co., Westminster — 3,902
- A. Lee Towson, Jr., Chestertown — 3,346
- Nathaniel J. Williams, Middletown — 2,513

Massachusetts:
- Columbian National Life Insurance Co., Boston — 4,143
- John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston — 90,031

Michigan:
- G. Elwood Bonine, Vandalia — 2,589
- L. E. Casey and Edward Brooks, Marshall — 2,697
- A. B. Chapman & Sons, South Rockwood — 2,238
- William H. Mathews, Niles — 2,731
- Upjohn, W. E. U. T. C., Richland — 2,464

Minnesota:
- Agricultural Credit Corporation, Minneapolis — 4,297
- Ruth T. Cathcart, Windom — 5,221
- Concordia College Corporation — 3,609
- Farmers & Merchants Savings Bank, Minneapolis — 5,931
- Federal Land Bank, St. Paul — 55,882
- First Minneapolis Co., Minneapolis — 4,559
- N. J. Florence, Hallock — 7,409
- A. J. Kaufman, Appleton — 6,524
- Frank Kiene, Kennedy — 9,791
- Maple Island Farms Co. Hollandale — 6,790
- E. G. Melo, Stephen — 5,973
- Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul — 5,544

Minnesota—Continued.
- Northwestern Improvement Co., St. Paul — $4,031
- Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., Minneapolis — 9,022
- The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, Minneapolis — 9,409
- St. Olaf College, Northfield — 4,392
- Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank, Minneapolis — 23,239
- James S. Thompson, Windom — 7,976
- Tilney Farm Co., St. James — 6,828
- A. R. Voss, St. James — 5,006
- Winona National & Savings Bank, Winona — 5,110

Mississippi:
- Abbay & Leatherman, Robinsonville — 7,266
- C. B. Box Estate, Midnight — 9,184
- W. P. Brown, Drew — 8,610
- J. P. Cole, Highlandale — 7,331
- Dixie Farms, Vance — 9,069
- J. R. Dockery, Cleveland — 9,249
- J. T. Fargason & Son, Lyon — 8,808
- J. L. Gaddis, Bolton — 8,113
- B. F. Harbert & Co., Robinsonville — 7,006
- Hopson Planting Co., Clarksdale — 8,069
- King & Anderson, Clarksdale — 9,910
- McKee Bros., Friars Point — 9,910
- Mississippi State Penitentiary, Parchman — 9,950
- Newton Naval Stores, Inc., Wiggins — 9,400
- R. W. Owen & Son, Evansville — 9,212
- Panther Burn Co., Leland — 7,549
- Robertshaw Co., Heathman — 7,981
- Lamont Rowlands, Picayune — 10,000

Missouri:
- Acom, O. H.; Smith, Emerson; Peterson, Glenn, Wardell — 11,729
- American Union Life Insurance Co., St. Joseph — 7,062
- E. P. Coleman, Jr., Sikeston — 12,170
- Columbia Hog & Cattle Powder Co., Kansas City — 6,417
- Federal Land Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis — 6,598
- General American Life Insurance Co., St. Louis — 11,556
- Kansas City Life Insurance Co., Kansas City — 16,759
- Gabe Rendleman, Mesler — 7,502
- W. T. Riley, New Madrid — 7,190

Montana:
- Antler Livestock Co., Wyola — 7,922
- Campbell Farming Corporation, Hardin — 12,174
- Cort Livestock Co., Big Timber — 6,757
- R. E. Davis, Willow Creek — 7,012
- Ed. Kopac, Hardin — 7,515
- A. J. Rasmussen, Harlem — 8,009
- Scheffels Bros., Great Falls — 12,836
- Schmityler Corporation, Froid — 10,941
- Wismeyer & Shawhan, Billings — 6,653

Nebraska:
- Bankers Life Insurance Co. of Nebraska, Omaha — 40,912
- Brown Land Co., Omaha — 18,101
- Conservative Savings & Loan Association, Omaha — 4,926
- D. W. Evans, Watson — 9,702
- Federal Land Bank of Omaha, Omaha — 62,483
- Fremont Joint-Stock Land Bank, Lincoln — 11,528
- Grinnell College, Omaha — 5,901
- Hamilton County Farms Co., Aurora — 4,626
- Kilpatrick Bros. Co, Beatrice — 11,441
- Lincoln Joint-Stock Land Bank of Lincoln, Nebr., Lincoln — 24,471

Nevada:
- Lester C. Munk, Lovelock — 8,158
- C. A. Sewell, Elko — 3,317
- Utah Construction Co., Montello — 4,448

New Hampshire: None over $1,000.

New Jersey:
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark $185,869
The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark 132,248
Seabrook and Baitinger, Bridgeton 8,245

New Mexico:
Hal Bogle, Dexter 6,597
Del Cerro Co-op Association, Las Cruces 8,370
The Diamond A Cattle Co., Roswell 6,059
John Garrett, Jr., Clovis 9,141
Bun Lewis, Grady 6,658
Cecil Porter, Clovis 6,730
H. F. Prewitt, Coolidge 9,000
D. F. and Joyce H. Stahmann, Las Cruces 8,370
J. P. White Co., Roswell 9,078

New York:
Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City 115,081
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York City 148,691
New York Life Insurance Co., New York City 14,392
Security Mutual Life Insurance Co., Binghamton 2,810

North Carolina:
M. C. Braswell Farms, Battleboro 4,977
Caledonia State Prison Farm, Halifax 6,223
Duke Power Co., Charlotte 7,213
McNair Investment Co., Laurinburg 6,178
John F. McNair, Inc., Laurinburg 4,335
Z. V. Pate, Inc., Laurinburg 7,446

North Dakota:
John J. Deschenes and Henry M. Baldwin, Cando 9,886
Equitable Reserve Association, Neenah 5,424
E. J. Lander Co., Grand Forks 4,316
McCanna Farming Co., McCanna 5,620
McKensie County, Watford City 4,197
Murphy & Murray, Grand Forks 4,661
State of North Dakota, Bismarck 49,682
Olaf Pierson, York 8,531
J. Scott, Gilby 6,299

Ohio:
Agricultural Lands, Inc., London 12,611
Brady Bros., Payne 22,155
Ohio National Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati 10,076
Orleton Farms, London 14,137
Union Central Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati 73,432

Oklahoma:
Jacob Q. Bacon, Elkhart 4,356
Big V Ranch, Ponca City 6,288
O. J. Gales, Tonkawa 3,101
R. C. Drummond, Hominy 3,757
G. E. Irvin, Gage 3,384
Sid Jones, Duncan 3,457
Rolla Lathrop, Keyes 3,014
Emery L. Metcalf, Helena 3,924
E. C. Mullendore, Hulah 9,640
Protho Perkins Co., Wichita Falls, Tex 3,545
Owen W. and W. H. Temple, Buffalo 3,863
(All others under $3,000.)

Oregon:
F. H. Banfield, Portland 8,134
Cunningham Sheep Co., Pendleton 12,107
Dixon & McQuiston, Klamath 9,103
Eastern Oregon Land Co., Ontario 10,023
John H. Hales, Adams 12,910
James K. Hill, Pendleton 9,660
H. A. Miller, Bond 9,066
Pendleton Ranches, Inc., Pendleton 14,640
M. E. Weatherford, Arlington 8,767

Pennsylvania:
Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia $6,478
Penn. Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia 18,208
Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia 30,750
Trexler Farms, Allentown 6,550
Lauxmont Farms, Wrightsville 4,534
(All others under $4,000)

Rhode Island (only one): Harold B. Tarbox, Slocum 1,074

South Carolina:
Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville 6,568
J. A. Fletcher, McColl 4,020
R. J. Moyes, Jr., Mayesville 5,292
D. K. McColl, Bennettsville 6,729
Jerry Richardson, Barnwell 4,223
C. W. Stone, Clinton 4,516
P. A. Wallace, Bennettsville 5,044
(All others under $4,000.)

South Dakota:
Wm. J. Asmussen, Agar 4,620
R. P. England, Stamford 4,872
The Grand Lodge of the Ancient Order of United Workmen of North Dakota, Aberdeen, S. Dak 4,734
H. F. Hansmeier, Bristol 4,503
Rural Credit Board of South Dakota, Pierre 6,283
T. R. Walker Estate, Vermillion 5,549
(All others under $4,500.)

Tennessee:
Dillard & Coffin Co., Memphis 5,302
John C. Jackson, Jr., Tiptonville 5,463
G. F. Parker, Tiptonville 4,014
Tennessee Farm Corporation, Clarksville 5,302
J. E. Vaughn, Tiptonville 4,107
(Balance under $4,000.)

Texas:
Mrs. C. Adair Estate, Floyd Bennett Field, Long Island, N. Y. 9,948
Ollie P. Anderson, Pecos 9,900
O. V. Beck, Amarillo 9,405
Grover C. Brillhart, Spearman 11,687
Richard C. Buckles, Stratford 11,998
S. B. Burnett Estate, Fort Worth 9,684
Geo. F. Buzzard, Spearman 9,454
Callaghan Land & Pastoral Co., Encinal 9,900
Capitol Freehold Land & Trust, Farwell 17,532
J. R. Durrett, Amarillo 11,074
Fred S. Fegel, Amarillo 10,273
A. S. Gage Ranches, Marathon 9,800
Haden B. Hart, Gruver 10,311
Hueco Cattle Co., El Paso 9,900
Chas. L. Killgore, Amarillo 16,194
H. L. Kokernot & Son, Alpine 9,800
Martin & Zimmerman, Floydada 10,359
Matador Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., Denver, Colo 9,863
Clyde Merryman, Plainview 10,541
L. M. Price Co., Stratford 9,455
Malcolm J. Shelton, Amarillo 9,340
Malcolm Stewart, Dalhart 9,967
The Sugarland Industries, Sugarland 9,800
Texas Land & Development Co., Plainview 12,011
W. T. Waggoner Estate, Vernon 10,160
Asa Willis, Hatley 10,104
(Too many to enumerate.)

Utah:
John Adams, Brigham City 4,864
Perry Land & Livestock Co., Salt Lake City 4,200
(Balance under $4,000.)

Vermont (only 2):
Burlington Savings Bank, Burlington 1,677
National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier 32,473

Virginia:
Eastern Shore Canning Co., Machipongo 3,625

Virginia—Continued.
Stuart Land and Cattle Co., Cedar Bluff $3,965
G. L. Webster Co., Inc., Cheriton 9,510
(Balance under $3,000.)

Washington:
C. J. Broughton, Dayton 20,170
Don Damon, Cunningham 10,788
Win C. Estes, Prescott 11,221
Fred W. Hair, Prescott 10,549
Hugh Huntley, Colfax 7,262
Fred Lasater, Prescott 8,227
W. A. Longmeier, Lind 9,022
McGregor Land & Livestock Co., Hooper 16,071
Sheffels Bros., Govan 9,299
Ed Tucker, Walla Walla 10,409
Nettie E. Woodward, Walla Walla 10,866

West Virginia: (Only 4 loans, all under $2,000.)

Wisconsin:
Better Farms, Inc., Fond du Lac 6,197
George W. Borg, Delavan 3,365
H. W. Burmeister, Gratiot 2,046
Larsen Canning Co., Green Bay 1,227
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee 51,651
Old Line Life Insurance Co. of America, Milwaukee 9,538

Wyoming:
Cow Creek Sheep and Pioneer Sheep Co., Rawlins 4,330
Lee Sheep Co., Rawlins 4,034
Miller Land & Livestock Co., Parkman 12,025
Leroy Moore, Ross 4,019
Mortons, Inc., Douglas 6,071
(Balance under $4,000.)

Alaska: None.

Hawaii:
Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., Honolulu 10,000
Hutchinson Sugar Plantation Co., Naalehu Kau 2,956
Annie T. K. Parker (trust), Honolulu 4,057
Ulupalakua Ranch, Ltd., Waiakoa, Maui 6,360

Puerto Rico (only 3):
Luis Rivera, Comerio 2,284
Adolfo San Feliz, Comerio 1,772
Rafael Aponte Sanchez, San Lorenzo 1,214

Mr. Chairman, now let us review some of these payments. Let us review them in the light of the fact that we are now engaged in a world-wide war; in the light of the fact of a national debt of $300,000,000,000; in the light of the fact that we have a tax bill that reaches down to the low-income brackets; in the light of legislation for the few at the expense of the many; in the light of the fact that in past years some Members have justified these large subsidies to insurance companies and large operators on the basis that it was necessary to have the large operators cooperate in order to control and reduce food and fiber production; in the light of the fact that this argument is worthless now as no one would contend, you need to make these enormous payments for reducing production at this time; in the light of the fact that no appropriation whatever has been included in the agricultural bill for the use of the farmers in the low-income brackets that are serviced by the Farm Security Administration; and lastly in the light of the fact that most of us have assured our constituents that we would oppose all nonwar expenditures.

Who can say that the reduction of these payments to $200 would decrease food production?

Let us ask ourselves a few questions.

First. The school-lunch program was defeated on the grounds of the purchasing power of the people and on the grounds of economy. Do you feel that if this abolition of school lunches which was to cost $50,000,000 was advisable, that we should provide 33,000 large land owners—whether insurance companies or individuals—a gratuity of $58,000,000 for doing something they should be doing anyway for their own welfare?

Second. Take a look at the Arizona list of checks for from $5,000 to $9,000 to big cattle ranches.

Third. Look at the California list receiving $10,000 to $24,000. Do you suppose they are subsidizing labor from other countries for these same big operators?

Fourth. In Colorado they send one sugar company $3,600 and another $4,500.

Fifth. You will note that $166,000 of the $196,000 that went in large checks to Connecticut went to five life insurance companies. Do you really believe that the $166,000 is needed to make their policies good?

Sixth. Florida is interesting. One sumatra tobacco company received over $6,000. Some types of tobacco are 200 to 300 percent of parity. Does this make sense?

Seventh. Do you realize that according to Dr. Goodsell's studies the two-mule Georgia cotton farmers received in 1942 but 22 cents labor income per hour, and that of this 22 cents per hour labor income only 2 cents per hour was from Government payment. However, in Georgia in 1942, 370 large operators received on the average over $2,000 each. This subsidy would be a down payment on quite a farm in that State. If all the farmers in the United States had the same subsidy 370 large operators received, it would take an appropriation of $1,200,000,000. This indicates how futile this approach is in solving the farm soil or price problem.

Eighth. To look at the Illinois list one would never realize the great areas of rich produce fertile land within the confines of that State, would one? The first trust joint stock land banks of Chicago receive a $54,000 subsidy.

Ninth. Kansas has had recipients receiving subsidies of from $10,000 to $31,000.

Tenth. In the Kentucky blue-grass area only one received a $5,000 subsidy.

Eleventh. In Maine one potato company, the Woodman Co., received $6,900. Floor or support prices are supplemented with a large additional subsidy.

Twelfth. Maryland—close to the best markets in America—had several subsidies but mostly under $5,000. Do you suppose the same ones get the $14-per-ton hay subsidy, too?

Thirteenth. Massachusetts has one life-insurance company that received $90,000 out of the total of $102,000 that went for the large checks in that State.

Fourteenth. Fifty-five thousand dollars was paid to the Federal land bank in Minnesota.

Fifteenth. Big operations in Mississippi did pretty well. The State penitentiary is much below former years and before the $10,000 State limit was put into effect.

Sixteenth. Montana. The Campbell Farming Corporation is down to $12,000. This is much reduced.

Seventeenth. New Jersey is worth the time to examine. Two insurance companies received $318,000 of our grandchildren's money.

Eighteenth. New Mexico can surely obtain many large subsidies for the amount of the Nation's food it produces.

Nineteenth. Two insurance companies in New York received $263,000. Does this make sense to you? According to Dr. Goodsell's studies the dairymen in central New York received less than 1 cent per hour as Government payments in 1942.

Twentieth. Three thousand three hundred big operators in Texas receive over $6,000,000. In Dr. Goodsell's official report farmers on family sized selected farms on the black waxy land in Texas the same year received 19 cents per hour. Three cents per hour was in Government payments. Is it any wonder that Texas has exhibited the attitude it has?

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EDWARD REES of Kansas, assisted by the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota, have led the fight to reduce these payments to $1,000 and also to $500. Last year the House fixed the maximum payment at $500, but it was removed in the other body.

In the letter of transmittal which is furnished according to law by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker of the House, there is one paragraph that should be of interest to every Member of the House.

The letter of transmittal is from Mr. Grover Hill. This paragraph is:

> The great majority of farmers participating in the 1942 program earned payments of less than $200. Approximately 95 percent were in this classification.

If 95 percent of the farmers participating in the program received less than $200 each, do you not agree that a $200 maximum would be fair for all the participants?

Congress, and every Member of both bodies must answer for taxation or the method of taking money from the people for public needs. Is not here an opportunity to more fairly distribute public funds, and would not a wider distribution be used for an increased food supply? I feel that if the Members would obtain the long list of farmers that receive a $20 check, they would not hesitate to put a $200 ceiling on these subsidy payments. This should be ample for any family sized farm and why subsidize more generously the above family sized farms?

The importance of this rural financing is and should most assuredly be of interest to every Member since Dr. A. G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration writes me on March 11, 1944, as follows:

> We believe that 4 percent per annum is a fair and reasonable rate on long-term mortgage loans of the type made by the Federal land banks through national farm loan associations and with their endorsement. Similarly we believe that a 5-percent interest rate is reasonable for the type of first- and second-mortgage loan made by the Land Bank Commissioner, which carries no endorsement liability, and which, in general, is a more hazardous credit risk than the land-bank loan.

Our Government would receive—3½ to 4 percent—½ percent more interest on Federal land bank and—3½ to 5 percent—1½ percent more interest on the Land Bank Commissioner loans. On January 1, 1944, there were 482,779 Federal land-bank loans with a total of $1,357,937,417. An increase in interest rate would provide $6,789,687 in additional revenue.

On January 1, 1944, there were 318,282 Land Bank Commissioner loans with a total indebtedness of $406,190,206. The increased interest rate from 3½ to 5 percent would provide $6,092,853 in additional revenue.

In the United States this would extract $12,882,540 in additional interest directly from the rural people of America. This increase in interest will be reflected in higher interest rates by private loaning agencies that make farm loans.

In Wisconsin alone this increase in interest rate will amount to $274,436 from Federal land-bank loans, and $367,702 from Land Bank Commissioner loans, or a total of $642,138 for the State. There were 18,723 Federal land-bank loans, and 15,312 Commissioner loans in Wisconsin on January 1, 1944.

If we are forced to accept Dr. Black's position and increase the interest rate to obtain $12,000,000, and take it from the producers that owe money, do you feel we are justified at this time in doling out $58,000,000 to 3,300 big land owners and insurance companies? You and I have the responsibility of making this decision. I have made mine as a result of careful study. Are you ready to make yours? This might be an appropriate time to have one of those "stand up and be counted" procedures we have been hearing about.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the more I see of the illogical, indefensible waste of public funds the more I feel like paraphrasing Scott and saying: "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to Benedict Roth hath said 'This is the bunk.' "

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman that we should not criticize the A. A. A. for something and then by appropriation or otherwise insist on them doing certain things. So far as the gentleman knows, is there anything in the A. A. A. program, or that we gave to the A. A. A., to set itself up as a board to determine who is entitled to deferment by reason of being an essential agriculturist, or has the Congress ever authorized the

A. A. A. to act as a board or an agency to determine who is entitled to farm machinery, or has the Congress ever authorized the A. A. A. to determine under the A. A. A. program which farmers are entitled to gasoline to be used not in their tractors but on the highways? If the gentleman can answer those questions and say that those of us who have criticized the A. A. A. for sending out information to farmers now that these things I have just mentioned will be used in considering whether they are going to permit a farmer to have machinery or whether they are going to permit him to be deferred, that is another thing entirely. I have criticized the A. A. A. for that and I still criticize it. I do not know where the Congress has ever authorized them to do anything of that kind.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has not asked one question, but several questions. If I were to answer the questions from the knowledge I have at this moment, I would say: I presume what the gentleman refers to are the activities of the War Food Administration which do not necessarily come under the A. A. A. In most, if not all the States, the Chairman of the A. A. A. happens to be the head of the War Food Board. I presume that those things that the gentleman complains of are done under the War Food Boards rather than by the A. A. A. set-up. That would be my understanding of the organization at the present time. In most cases they are the same individuals. If there is any law it comes under the powers that have been delegated to the War Food Administrator by Executive order and is not part of any law passed by the Congress.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman say that by Executive order the War Food Administration has now been given authority to determine who is entitled to a draft deferment as an essential farmer?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would say it may have been so construed. There is a rather broader interpretating of many laws and orders.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman say further that the War Food Administration, by Executive decree, has been authorized to determine who shall be entitled to a quota of farm machinery?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will look up the law under which this power has been delegated, I am sure he will find it is quite broad, and he will find that the interpretation of it is very, very broad. It will include most anything, as I found out last summer when a certain employee of the War Meat Board was telling all the farmer butchers in my particular district that, if they did not have a new slaughterhouse within 10 days, he would cancel their permit to slaughter. That is what I ran into last summer. I later found the writer of the letter did not have permission to write the letter from any superior officeholder. I did find out that he must have been a political appointee, as his service record showed no experience whatsoever in regard to meats, or much of anything else. I did, however, find that I could not get the War Food Administrator, my friend, Mr. Marvin Jones, to write me that the employee had exceeded his legal authority. One of Mr. Jones' underemployees wrote me quoting the provisions of the Executive order, where this authority was supposed to come from. This is where these small people in big places can harm any program. They should be replaced by people who have the right attitude in regard to the public. I imagine that is part of the directive under which these other things you complain about operate, though I do not want to be too sure on that point.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What will the situation be in 1944 in regard to the farmers being able to get more machinery?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is going to be the same problem as to whether the farmer will get more overalls or not. There is plenty of steel for farm machinery. It is simply a matter of manpower. As far as the overalls are concerned, there is plenty of cotton, because we are pretty nearly giving it away to make insulating material. It is a matter of manpower and getting it into the cheaper garments. Those are problems we have to meet.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4443, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1945, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of the debate on the rivers and harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include therein a letter from Mr. Leo Crowley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MONETARY STABILIZATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

A FURTHER STUDY OF THE BRITISH SCHEME TO SECURE CONTROL OF UNITED STATES GOLD, COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS THE KEYNES-MORGENTHAU PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the present study should be considered in connection with a paper I presented on this subject to the House November 1, 1943. In that paper I established what I believe to be conclusive proof that there are not two plans, a British plan for an international clearing union and an American plan for a united and associated nations stabilization fund, but that there is in reality only one plan; namely the British plan. Benjamin M. Anderson has asserted as much—Anderson, Benjamin M., Post-war Stabilization of Foreign Exchange; the Keynes-Morgenthau Plan Condemned; Outline of a Fundamental Solution, in the Economic Bulletin, Capital Research Co., Los Angeles, Calif., May 11, 1943. For many years economic adviser to the Chase National Bank in New York, Dr. Anderson is now professor of economics, University of California at Los Angeles.

Dr. Melchior Palyi states that the two plans "deal practically only with the problem of Great Britain—Palyi, Dr. Melchior, Some Implications of the Keynes-Morgenthau International Clearing Pool, an address delivered at Union League Club, Chicago, April 28, 1943, and reprinted from the Great Lakes Banker, July 1943.

Indeed, I think the proof is clear in that paper that the officials of the administration who are responsible for having drawn up the draft for a "united and associated nations stabilization fund" did practically nothing but copy from and reword and rephrase the text of the British proposal for an international clearing union as outlined in the British white paper.

Several other points contained in the November 1 paper should be kept in mind in considering the present study. The scheme would involve the complete abandonment of the international gold standard as this term has been used and understood since gold has been used in international trade and commerce down to the present time—all protests by the promoters of the scheme to the contrary notwithstanding. It would substitute for the gold standard a fictitious

Office of Budget and Finance 78th-2nd, No. 54
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued March 24, 1944, for actions of Thursday, March 23, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations.....1,8,9
Crop insurance.....24
Dairy industry.....17,20
Electrification.....8,13
Farm Credit.....14
Farm situation.....12
Fisheries.....15
Food adm. (general)....21
Food distribution...17,20
Housing.....6
Irrigation.....2
Legislative program.....9
Manpower.....8,11,12,17
Personnel.....7,9
Post-war planning.....9
Price control.....18
Priorities.....19
Property disposition...22
Public debt.....23
Rationing.....3,10
Reclamation.....2
Regulatory functions....4
Stabilization program...5
Taxation.....9
Transportation.....16
War progress.....25

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Continued debate on this bill, H.R. 4443 (pp. 3007-41).

Agreed, 93-65, to an amendment by Rep. Harness, Ind., to provide "That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out of the salary, per diem allowance or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity" (pp. 3018, 3035-41).

Rep. Dirksen, Ill., criticized Government controls, permanent appropriations the number of USDA personnel, crop insurance, farm-wage stabilization, and land acquisition (inserting a record of Federal real estate by States); asked an investigation of Government corporations; urged printing of the Agriculture Yearbook on livestock; and expressed doubt as to whether the guayule program should be discontinued (pp. 3007-12). Rep. Anderson, Calif., spoke in support of the guayule program (pp. 2012-14). Rep. Cannon, Mo., discussed the Kefauver question-period resolution and similar measures (pp. 3014-16). Rep. Gossett, Tex., urged more recognition for the farmer (pp. 3016-17). Rep. Gilchrist, Iowa, urged higher soybean prices and discussed wheat imports (p. 3017). Rep. Bolton, Ohio, spoke in support of a school lunch program (pp. 3017-18). Rep. Hill, Colo., commended forest research (pp. 3018-19). Rep. Gillie, Ind., asked for increases in USDA veterinarians' salaries (pp. 3019-20). Rep. Sauthoff, Wis., stated that OPA is injuring the dairy industry (pp. 3020-21). Rep. Murray, Wis., discussed soil conservation (pp. 3021-2). Rep. Hinshaw, Calif., discussed the forest fire-control work (p. 3030). Rep. Brehm, Ohio, discussed the forestry program, including research (pp. 3030-2). Rep. Stefan, Nebr., commended the cooperative farm forestry program (p. 3032). Reps. J.L. Johnson, Calif., and Tarver discussed the provision against assessments for administration of food orders (pp. 3032-3). Rep. Dworshak, Idaho, discussed CCC's potato

program stating that Federal agencies create emergencies and then use Federal funds to overcome the same emergencies (p. 3034). Rep. Eliott, Calif., urged that arrangements be made for guayule production by the farmers themselves (pp. 3034-35).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Dirksen, Ill.: To provide $996,000 for reclassification of veterinarians; by a 32-50 vote (pp. 3022-9).

By Rep. Taber, N.Y.: To reduce BHNHE from $806,630 to $606,630; by a 57-60 vote (pp. 3029-30).

By Rep. Anderson, Calif.: To strike out the provision against farm-wage stabilization (pp. 3033-4).

2. IRRIGATION; RECLAMATION. Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H.R. 3570, to provide for the parial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam, Mont. (pp. 3006, 3063).

3. RATIONING. Rep. Brown, Ohio, announced that the Petroleum Committee would soon begin hearings on the distribution and rationing of oil and gasoline (p. 3007)

4. REGULATORY FUNCTIONS. Rep. Springer, Ind., commended H.R. 4314, the "Fair Government Practices Act," and discussed the basic objectives of the bill (pp. 3042-3).

5. STABILIZATION PROGRAM. Rep. Patman, Tex., discussed the stabilization program, stating that it is "one of the most successfull accomplishments in the whole war effort," discussing subsidies, rationing, farm income, agricultural prices and farmland speculation (pp. 3043-8).

6. HOUSING. Rep. Dirksen, Ill., reviewed his reasons for favoring the liquidation of H.O.L.C., stating, "Its continuance beyond a reasonable time is...an invitation...for the establishment of a pattern which is a menace to the free enterprise system of the future" (pp. 3 47-63).

7. PERSONNEL. Received CSC's proposed legislation to amend Sec. 3 of the Classification Act. To Civil Service Committee. (p. 3063.)

8. APPROPRIATIONS. Received supplemental appropriation estimates for the Bonneville Power Administration for the fiscal year 1945 (H.Doc. 510) and for the War Manpower Commission for the fiscal year 1945 (H.Doc. 511). To Appropriations Committee. (p. 3063.)

9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader McCormack announced that H.R. 4381, to prevent multiple taxes on Federal employees' salaries will be debated Mon.; that if the Rules Committee reports out a resolution creating a post-war military committee, it will be taken up next week; that it is intended to recess next Thurs. or Fri. until April 11; and that the naval appropriation bill will be taken up April 13 (p. 3041).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. RATIONING. Rep. McGregor, Ohio, inserted his correspondence regarding A.A.A. certification of farmers' gasoline rations (p. A1560).

11. LABOR, FARM. Rep. Auchincloss, N.J., inserted his letter regarding the farm labor situation (p. A1561).

referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House who may be interested, I am happy to advise that the Committee on Petroleum of the House, this week agreed that hearings will soon be held by that committee on the distribution and rationing of oil and gasoline. These hearings are scheduled to begin just as soon as the present hearings on oil production are concluded, probably in about 10 days, and will cover all of the ramifications of the distribution and rationing of gasoline, including the recent order reducing the A rations in the West and Midwest, the black-market angle, and the distribution system, that will be of interest to the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

A TRIBUTE

Mr. Chairman, it is always a privilege in the consideration of an appropriation bill to pay testimony to those who have done so much in the preparation of the measure. First I want to pay my annual tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER. I have a real affection for him, and I have a great admiration for his intimate knowledge of the measure that is before us. The Members of Congress do not always appreciate the immense amount of painstaking labor and attention to detail that goes into the preparation of this bill. They do not always have a full appreciation of what it means to pilot a measure of such magnitude across the floor. Yet the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, has been so profoundly familiar with all the details and has such a capacity for handling the little controversies that are bound to arise, that he has evoked my admiration over a long period of time. So I feel that it is a privilege to pay public testimony to his diligence and capacity as a public servant. That is equally true of our diligent and devoted committee clerk.

Over and over again I have paid testimony to Arthur Orr who has been in the service of the Government for more than 20 years, and who labors so diligently, early and late, on matters of this kind. The House does not generally know that the committee clerks so often labor until midnight and 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning in order to straighten out that wealth of detail that is necessary before a measure is ready for the floor.

So, to my good chairman and all the members of the committee and to our committee clerk, I once more pay humble testimony for the great work they have done and for the privilege of enjoying their fellowship in the preparation of a bill of this kind.

CONTROVERSY IN OTHER YEARS

On previous bills we have had a great deal of controversy. On one occasion we kept the measure on the floor of the House for 11 days when the Secretary of Agriculture was in Mexico. It caused him no end of difficulty. It ran beyond the end of the fiscal year and he could not even use the travel money provided in the bill and had to come back out of his own pocket. There was a belief, perhaps in some quarters, that it was a sumptuary and arbitrary attitude. With me, however, it was a matter of deep conviction as I belabored the various items in the bill, because I have been so thoroughly wedded to agriculture as a faith, to agriculture as a way of life, to agriculture as the very essence of this rather amorphous thing that we call freedom. It is because I had that intense conviction that I was willing to keep that bill on the floor insofar as my humble talents and my physical energies permitted, indefinitely if necessary, to fight out some of these controversies.

FOOD AND FREEDOM

After all, freedom makes agriculture; freedom makes production. The great problem now, as ever, is to produce sufficient subsistence, not only for ourselves but for the countries with whom we are engaged in this great war effort. You can go back into history and find that we have conquered our food problems in proportion as we have been devoted to freedom of the men who till the soil. Prior to 1800 it was the common thing for people to go to bed hungry. Hunger was accepted as a matter of course. That was only 150 years ago. People thought nothing of it. They thought probably it was one of the providential punishments for the sins of the earth. In that 400-year period just ahead of that, the world experienced seven famines each century, each of which were nearly 10 years in duration. Think of 70 years of famine in a century, for four continuous centuries. Then something happened. We began to get away from the feudal system. Through our own rebellion, men got the right to own land. There was a striving and a stirring in the souls of people who were seeking for this indefinable thing that we call freedom.

FREEDOM AND LAND OWNERSHIP

With the right to till the soil as freemen, with the right to own a portion of the earth's surface, there was stimulated also the inventive genius of people, particularly in this country. The evidence is eloquent on that point. The foundation for our real inventions for farm machinery came in 1820, 1830, and 1840. That is when the real pattern of the reaper, the drill, and mower, and all those instrumentalities of the land were first contrived. So, freedom, plus machinery, plus the right to own land were the great forces that drove back the spectral hand of famine. We have not yet conquered famine in all corners of the earth, but at least in most of the regions of the earth today people do not accept hunger as a matter of course, and go to bed hungry almost every night in the week. That is a testimony to freemen tilling the soil that they own, who receive a fair reward for arduous labor, and are equipped with the machinery that makes the lush soil produce in abundance.

FREEDOM AND MACHINERY

Not even war has stifled the genius for better machinery and greater production. That was true in the Civil War. I think it was Secretary Stanton who said the reaper won the Civil War. In 1861, we produced only 20,000 reapers. It runs in my mind that in 1864 we produced 70,000. It was the reaper that made it possible to subsist our own people notwithstanding the fact that a million people had been taken from the farms to serve in uniform. It was the reaper that made it possible to keep sending food to other sections of the world. That was true of the World War. In 1914 we produced 10,000 tractors, but we continued to progress, and in 1919 we produced 165,000.

Freedom and machinery and the right to own a piece of the world's surface have been the great motivating forces for production. There were no W. P. B.'s in that day. There were not many farm labor problems in that day. There was no undue and restrictive interference by Government.

GOVERNMENT AND PRODUCTION

In proportion as government tinkers with that force there develops trouble and dislocation. The law of compensation and balance always works. Be there scarcity of machinery, then of course, you do not get tillage and you develop black markets. Are taxes too high, it serves as a deterrent on those who devote themselves diligently to the soil. Do we reach in and take the young farmers from the

soil and put them in uniform? After a while your production begins to feel the effect of the hand of Selective Service. Always the law of balance and compensation manifests itself. So when we have agricultural problems today they spring, I think, in large measure, from the fact that government too often abitrarily intervenes. Was that not always true?

GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE IN OTHER DAYS

Go back to the days of Diocletion. That is 1,700 years ago. I have stated on this floor before that he was the gentleman who guided the destinies of Rome, and was the progenitor of the O. P. A. He felt it was permanent. He had price ceilings engraved on stones. There are 800 of them that still stand as mute testimony to the mistakes of government more than 1,700 years ago.

What happened? When he interfered with tillage, when he went so far as to set a price ceiling and restrictions upon all forms of business and agricultural activities from the price of barley to the use of a donkey to carry a given number of pounds 1 mile, then, of course tillage and production began to fall off. That is when famine and hunger began. It was ever thus.

So I go back to the original premise. One reason why I fought so diligently on some of these agricultural appropriation bills and kept them here so long was because I had a deep and abiding conviction on what I think is the essence of agriculture as a way of life. It becomes a matter of abiding principle.

We go back then to the premise that food is tied up with freedom in agriculture and it must become something more than an academic thing.

We have gone quite far in this bill, I think, in preserving the essential freedom. The committee is virtually unanimous on this bill and I have but a single amendment that does not affect major policy. I am very happy over that fact that we can come here with a bill that we can report unanimously. We are preserving for the man who tills the soil that kind of freedom that is not dominated by bureaus and personnel of Government. That will make real production.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman be kind enough to yield for one short observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. People who love art always delight in listening to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, whose speech is art in its finest form.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my good friend; I feel truly complimented.

HUMBLE APOSTLE OF FREEDOM

In this connection I want to tell you about a witness who came before our committee. He intrigued me a great deal, first because he was a real farmer; secondly, because he paid his own way to come before the committee; and third, because he was a very humble man who had lived intimately with the soil and who saw the problems and who saw that America required in the days to come. I want to inscribe his name by my words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I think he is so eminently worthy of it. His name is F. W. Boswell, of Wilson, N. C. I think you ought to read his testimony because it is so refreshing. You will find it on page 1420 of the hearings. I want to give you just one or two items therefrom. He said:

> I am a farmer and came right off of my farm, and I left a sweet wife and daughter there when I left. I have plenty of sheep and hogs, and plenty of feed. I paid for a round-trip ticket here to appear before this committee.

He is devoted to soil conservation. He says here he bought a farm for $20 an acre and today he can sell it for $200 an acre. He is truly a farmer. He has made two blades of grass grow where one grew before. He says this about soil conservation:

> Not long ago a man from another county came down to our county and wanted to rent a farm. They asked him if he knew anything about farming and he said: "Of course I do. Why, hell, I have worn out three farms already." This is the reason for so much land that must be reclaimed.

That is so essentially right. The most professorial scholar in the Department could not phrase the problem any better than this humble farmer. Then he said this:

> There are 150 farms in my county that are not rented and are not cultivated.

I wanted to know why they were not cultivated. He said the former occupants had taken work in industrial plants where they could get a dollar and a dollar and a quarter an hour. Then he said:

> But some day they will come back.

Yes; they will come back to the sweet and the lush soil, and so we must find the answer to that challenge when men once more turn their attention to the problem of subsistence and production in the piping times of peace that will follow this global conflict. But is it not refreshing to have a man whose hands are hard with toil pay his own way to the Nation's Capital to appear before a committee and there to tell a humble, persuasive, and convincing story? That is the essence of freedom, that is the essence of our republican form of government where men are so interested in what we do here at the seat of government that at their own expense they come and make their representations before those who are the stewards of the public weal. It revitalizes one's faith in the people of this country.

And so, Mr. Boswell, wherever you may be this morning, God bless you, and all power to you because you are the essence, you are the substance of this great thing we call the Republic of America; you are a worthy testimony to these interesting articles on the Republic by Dr. Beard that have been appearing in Life magazine for the last 5 or 6 weeks.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. May I not add also that the self-sufficiency exemplified by this Mr. Boswell is stimulating?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

There are some things in the bill to which I wish to call attention though in a rather general way. To me, however, they are interesting. One thing to which I wish to call the attention of the membership is the fact that the bill is made up of four kinds of appropriations; they become very confusing even for members of the committee: There are direct appropriations, there are permanent appropriations, there are reappropriations, and there are trust accounts. We make it so hard for ourselves and we develop so much confusion. I do not see why we do not abolish all permanent appropriations. When we set up a permanent appropriation we have also divested Congress of control. We have in a way impaired our own power over the public purse. Some day I think a special committee ought to give some attention to it, ought to explore this great labyrinth of permanent appropriations, and abolish every one of them. Then we could deal with them individually as direct appropriations and revest the control in its entirety over the public purse in this body where it constitutionally belongs.

DISTRIBUTION BY FUNCTIONS

In the aggregate this bill contains about $10,000,000 for administrative purposes, $15,000,000 for extension, $48,000,000 for research. That research item carries out the original purposes of the bill that was signed by Lincoln in 1862 which created the agency of agriculture. I believe the language of that provision is:

> To diffuse useful knowledge among those who till the soil.

So here is $48,000,000 for research, $28,000,000 for forestry, $29,000,000 for war food, $320,000,000 for soil conservation and domestic allotments, and for the Soil Conservation Service.

At this point let me make a confession. I have belabored the soil conservation item a good deal in other years, but since then I have had the privilege of going into many States of the Union and seeing what they are doing. Frankly, I changed my mind, and so I was rather happy about the increase here because I think the farmers and the country are getting their money's worth in the work that Dr. Bennett and the Soil Conservation Service are doing. An open confession is good for the soul. I say very frankly that in other years, perhaps through provincial knowledge or lack of knowledge maybe, I was enlisted on the wrong side. So I am glad to add my voice to this item because I think it is a very worthy service.

There is a little over $7,000,000 for food distribution, and about $60,000,000 for the credit agency.

PERSONNEL IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Let me call your attention to the matter of employment in the Department of Agriculture, for I think you will be interested. In total number there are now 60,858 full-time employees and 15,607 part-time employees. The total therefore is 80,433. This is a rather substantial personnel for one department of the Government.

DISTRIBUTION BY PURPOSES

Let me call your attention to the distribution of the expenditures by purposes, for grants, subsidies, and contributions. Fifty-five percent of this money will be allocated. Nineteen percent goes to investment and loans, 20 percent goes to personal services. Stated in another way $20 out of every $100 we appropriate go to Federal pay roll. It is an indication that in that field there is much to be done in the development of efficiency, economy, and, shall I say, a better bureaucracy? There will always be bureaus of course. Congress must delegate to some ministerial agency certain authority that Congress itself cannot very well administer; but perhaps we can have better administrators, more efficient administrators, and fewer people to do a better job. This of course redounds to the benefit of the taxpayers of the country.

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS ARE POSSIBLE

Let me call your attention to the number of employees in the Farm Security Administration, a portion of which has been stricken from this bill, to prove contentions I made in other years. You will remember when I edified you—I hope—with the fact that in 1942 Farm Security had over 19,000 employees. I insisted then that it could operate with a lesser number. In 1943 it had dropped to 14,682, from 19,000. In the fiscal year 1944 it dropped from 14,000 to 11,000. In the fiscal year 1945 our esteemed former colleague, Mr. Hancock, in whom I have an abiding and resolute faith, indicated that he could do his job with 9,514. That is a far cry from 19,000; that is 10,000 fewer people in that agency, and yet if that agency continues it would have more work to do, more loans to administer than it had in 1942. That, I think, is rather eloquent proof that it can be done. Here is a fruitful field for our efforts.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. Chairman, a word now about crop insurance. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] has introduced a new bill to establish crop insurance, and has varied indemnities and the premium policy therein so as to more nearly approximate the hope that we can get away from losses. You may notice on page 875 of the hearings what crop insurance has cost us on two commodities, namely, wheat and cotton. It is their own testimony that up to June 30, 1944, for administrative expenses and for the excess indemnities over premiums it will have cost us $63,113,040. That is a rather expensive experiment. I felt last year and still feel it should be discontinued, and I sincerely hope the House will sustain the committee. If a bill is reported to revive the Crop Insurance Corporation, I trust that the House will reaffirm the action it took last year and bring this activity to an end. After all, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go if we are going to be the proper husbands of the public purse. The taxpayers, too, in general, are entitled to a break from this Congress.

WAGE STABILIZATION

A word about wage stabilization. You will remember the first word that went out from the War Food Administration that they were going to stabilize farm wages. This is an enormous job. For instance, here is a man working as a laborer on a farm or as a farm helper. In determining the ceiling on his wage, what will you include? Does it include the rent for the house in which he lives and how much rent will you determine for that house? Will wou determine as much for that as you would for a piece of property in Northeast Washington or in my home town? Somebody has to determine that. Suppose the owner of that farm gives him a couple of pigs to raise for his subsistence; will those be counted as a part of his emoluments? Suppose he uses the landlord's car to make a weekly trip or a daily trip to the city, will you attach a rent to that car and include it? There are many difficulties that arise. It requires people to resolve all those problems. Then growing bureaucracy, growing control, new orders and regulations start on the march.

At the outset they said that in January this year they had only 9 people working in connection with the function of wage stabilization, but for the fiscal year 1945 they wanted 38 departmental employees and 176 field employees, making a total of 214. So, they had 9 in January of this year and for the next fiscal year they want 214 to stabilize farm wages at a total expenditure of something over $800,000. The committee in its wisdom felt that we should not permit that, and the committee quite unanimously agreed to delete those funds from the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I am in hearty accord with what the gentleman has said with reference to the agricultural wage stabilization matter, but I think it might be interesting to the Committee of the Whole to call attention to the fact that statistics which we have had inserted in the RECORD show that of approximately 2,200,000 farm laborers in the United States 1,900,000 plus receive less than $600 per year and that this project is intended to have to do not with placing any floor under farm wages but with placing a ceiling on farm wages and it could not, therefore, be of any benefit to the vast majority of those who are farm laborers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] expresses my conviction on the subject and I think the consensus of opinion of the entire committee.

GUAYULE

Let me say a word now about rubber. The action that we took disturbed me a little, particularly in light of the testimony given by Colonel Dewey before the Committee on Agriculture only yesterday. Here in a small package is the sum and substance of our guayule activity. When the bill was passed to authorize this venture several years ago we provided $19,000,000 plus in 1943. In 1944 we provided $11,000,000 plus. That is substantially $30,000,000 for the guayule experiment. In 1945 we have an estimate of $5,338,000. Out of that thus far we can show that guayule shrubs from 550 acres have been milled and sold to the Rubber Reserve Company at 27 cents a pound or a total of $236,000 plus; also 200 tons were milled from the wild shrub in Texas.

In starting this experiment they leased 60,000 acres of land. The War Food Administration then became just a little apprehensive about the problem of food and the separation of this acreage from our food domain. They thought, therefore, that some of it ought to be returned, so 28,000 acres was either subleased or returned, leaving 32,000 acres, 70 percent of which is irrigated and 30 percent of which is not irrigated.

If you will consider all of the testimony it was not too impressive. The committee thought perhaps this project should be liquidated. I presume there are some who disagree with that. There are some, no doubt, who feel that this is something in the nature of an insurance investment; on the other hand, I thing we are making progress in the field of synthetic rubber.

The last report from the War Production Board given by Colonel Dewey indicates for 1944 it is anticipated that the production of synthetic rubber from Buna S, from butyl, and from Buna N will be 868,900 tons. For 1943 it was 124,000 tons and in the first quarter of 1944 it was 166,000 tons. We therefore produced more synthetic in the first quarter of 1944 than we have in the entire year of 1943. I have confidence that the men who go into the darknesses of the laboratory and who look so keenly on those strange agitations in the test tubes will finally find the answer to this rubber problem.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does the gentleman realize that the deleting of the rubber program, as contemplated in this bill, will in the long run mean the absolute destruction of 30,000 potential tons of real rubber?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether that is true or not. I was not persuaded with the point. I confessed at the outset when I came to this subject matter that I was a little disturbed about it. The committee, however, felt that it had not made the showing that it should for one reason or another and that perhaps it ought to be liquidated now, since it is a long-range program which will be of meager value to the war effort and will always be a costly venture.

Mr. OUTLAND. Is it not true that the experiments that have been taking place in reference to guayule practically started from scratch, that it was originally supposed that it would take at least 7 years to bring guayule into full production? Now it has been grown for only 3 or 4 years of that time and it is being cut down. Therefore, have we any evidence thus far to base an assumption that the guayule program should be discontinued?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We know, of course, that it was an emergency program, we know it was designed to bring some relief

if this war lasted too long; so we may say it is not going to be very productive in the course of the present conflict.

Mr. OUTLAND What has been the recommendation of the Rubber Director upon this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not recall that we had that. I will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to refresh my memory. I do not know whether we had any direct recommendation from Colonel Dewey himself or not. You see, this part of the program was handled by the Forest Service, so the testimony came from Mr Granger of that agency

Mr. TARVER. I think the evidence disclosed that the Rubber Director thought it should be continued for a period of 7 years, the liquidation not to be attempted prior to the expiration of this 7-year period; however, I feel that if the membership of the House will examine all of the facts detailed in the hearings they will arrive at the conclusion that was the result of the committee's deliberations, that is, that there is no reason to anticipate the production of any substantial amount of rubber for use during the period of this emergency by continuing a program upon which we have already spent approximately $45,000,000. These people in charge of the emergency rubber program are interested in the matter, of course, and they want it continued.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. OUTLAND. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is brief.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that this House has only recently authorized a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture to make a complete study of the guayule project, that it might have been wiser to suspend this particular part of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, I would have to answer that by saying it is a matter of opinion. I recognize that there is sentiment on both sides of the question.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

I want to raise one question with the House. We carry a provision here for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation, as you know, is a Delaware corporation. It was created by Executive order. The statutory authority for that order is the National Industrial Recovery Act. It has always seemed strange to me that a corporation chartered under the laws of the State could be given the power to pledge and to hypothecate the credit of the Government of the United States.

We have a good many corporations today of all kinds. They have a variety of authority. It becomes so bewildering that probably no man in Government can spell them out. They employ nearly 100,000 people today. They have pledged the credit of this Government contingently for nearly seventeen thousand million dollars. It is a fiscal wilderness, and one of the things that either the Committee on Appropriations could do or this House could do would be to authorize an exploration of that governmental corporate wilderness to see where we are, how deeply we are contingently indebted today and whether or not some order can be brought out of confusion and, so that we get a better and crystal-clear picture of what we do when we pass these amendments that go across the floor frequently to basic law that does something for or to these corporations in the form of extended authority and more money. I think it would be a very fruitful field of investigation.

AGRICULTURAL YEARBOOKS

You may know that we have authorized the printing of additional agricultural yearbooks titled "Keeping Livestock Healthy." There has been a tremendous demand for it. It is not one of these books that lasts today or tomorrow. It will be just as good, just as authoritative, just as useful 50 years from now as it will be today.

I notice that one of the young gentlemen of the press dealt with the matter recently and indicated that we were authorizing the use of a lot of paper for this purpose at a time when there was a paper shortage. If I remember correctly, he expressed it in terms of how much paper this would supply to the newspaper in my home town, the Pekin Daily Times, which, incidentally, is a very great newspaper, under the leadership of a very fine editor. He had it translated into those terms and figured that the yearbook paper would supply that daily newspaper for 2 years. There is an answer to it, and I think you should have it.

I asked the Government Printing Office to give me some idea of the amount of money expended by the agencies of the Government for paper. Congress spends $410,000. Keep that figure in mind. The Department of Commerce spends $1,447,000. That is 3½ times as much. The Navy Department spends $4,479,000 for paper. That is 10 times as much. The War Department spends $9,810,000. That is 23 times as much. The Department of Agriculture spends $642,000 for paper. The National Housing Agency spends $196,000 for paper. The Office of War Information spends $261,000 for paper.

Every morning, after I go through all these gaudy releases that come to my desk, printed in two or three colors, lovely booklets that are so eloquent of the typographical handicraft, mimeographs by the ton, they go into the wastebasket, after a suitable examination to see that the grains of wheat are culled from the chaff. It eases my conscience a good deal to be one of those who has approved the issuance of additional yearbooks for the men who are the stewards of millions of head of livestock in the country, to subsist not only the civilian population but the Army and the Navy as well; men who can look in that book, an authoritative book, and so often find the answer for a slight malady that gets into the herd or in his flock of chickens or sheep, or that may affect some other farm animal and fowl. I think it is one of the good investments that the Congress has made, because the work is scientific, useful, and durable, I can think of many other ways of saving paper which are far more constructive.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Last year the bill carried the same language, that "Keeping Livestock Alive" should be furnished during 1943. It was not done. Consequently, many of us had promised our good constituents that we would get that book and send it to them. Now, how am I going to transfer the blame from me to somebody else in that regard?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Being one of charitable impulse, I suggest that the gentleman fasten the blame partly on the Public Printer, partly on me, and partly on the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I would not place any blame on the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The explanation is simple indeed.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Tell the truth about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They did not have sufficient capacity in the Government Printing Office, so they were going to contract for the yearbook. When they got the bids they found some difficulty in remaining within the authorized amount, so the Public Printer came before us very recently, and then, after examining into the statement and looking into the bids, we authorized him to go ahead.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can I keep on making this false promise now henceforth?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will not be a false promise. It will be a deferred promise, because it will probably eventuate in October or November.

Mr. GILCHRIST. There is a difference between a false promise and a prevarication you know.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I think it should appear in the RECORD that the bid which is being accepted by the Public Printer at this time is within the limits of the appropriation provided in the bill for the current fiscal year, and it is anticipated that deliveries of the yearbook will begin about October of the present year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr ANDERSON of California. I thoroughly enjoyed the gentleman's remarks about the claptrap coming to our office every morning. Could not Congress cut down the amount of paper used for that purpose by reducing very materially the amount of money appropriated for printing and binding in these appropriation bills?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I will say that the committee has labored diligently with this matter. We had it up with the Budget any number of times. It is pretty difficult when a department says, "We need so much for printing and binding,"

to say, "Well you can cut that just half in two." Then the invariable answer is that you cripple their functions. So, until we have more investigators to investigate into it and get the story at the other end, there will be some measure of guesswork in it.

PUBLIC LAND ACQUISITIONS

One other item I want to bring to your attention. It impressed itself on me when I was privileged to revel in the great open spaces of the western region of the country. People were talking about the vast amount of land that is acquired by the Federal Government. I think you ought to have the story.

Uncle Sam, as of January 30, 1943, owned 383,600,000 acres of land. That is the equivalent of the entire area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Ohio, Alabama, Kentucky, and Indiana.

The Federal Government owns 20 percent of the whole land area of this country. Three agencies are at the top. The Department of Agriculture owns and administers 162,752,000 acres. The Department of the Interior owns and administers 205,000,000 acres. The War Department owns and administers 6,316,000 acres. The Tennessee Valley Authority embraces 626,000 acres. Now, look what it means to some of these States.

Forty-two percent of the State of Arizona belongs to Uncle Sam. This means that 42 out of every 100 acres in the State are federally owned. Forty-one percent of the State of California is owned by the Federal Government, 34 percent of the State of Colorado, and 78 percent of the whole domain of Nevada belongs to Uncle Sam.

I could recite the rest of the States, but that is sufficient to indicate that this question of land acquisition is, in my judgment, deserving of scrutiny and attention. I have watched this bill pretty closely. If I thought there was a single acre to be acquired, I lifted my voice in protest. We are permitting some of the agencies in this bill to perfect some of the land condemnations that were made before 1942 and to perfect the title. I notice that the people in the Western States are getting vocal on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

They are particularly vocal since Mr. O'MAHONEY's article appeared in Readers Digest, stating that Uncle Sam was going to take over Jackson Hole, in Wyoming, that the country was being remade, and that the people will not like it. No; they will not like it. They do not like it. They are beginning to say so already. That is why you see a resurgence of fundamental thinking in the country today. They are becoming afraid of a centralized and overweening government that may some day imperil their freedom.

A summarization of our Federal land holdings as of June 30, 1940, may be of interest to the Members if it has not already come to your attention and I therefore include it for all of the States:

TABLE III.—*Record of Federal real estate, by States*[1] *(as of June 30, 1940)*

State	Number of projects	Number of counties	Number of— Counties having Federal projects	Number of— Cities having Federal projects	Acreage of Federal real estate: Public domain	Acreage of Federal real estate: Otherwise acquired (purchase, condemnation, donation, etc.) Rural	Acreage of Federal real estate: Otherwise acquired (purchase, condemnation, donation, etc.) Urban	Acreage of Federal real estate: Total	Acreage of State: Total	Acreage of State: Federal	Cost of Federal real estate: Land	Cost of Federal real estate: Improvements	Cost of Federal real estate: Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
										Percent			
Alabama	370	67	66	73	44,516	884,253	1,771	930,540	32,818,560	2.84	$29,590,781	$142,168,947	$171,759,728
Arizona	189	14	14	16	30,585,679	356,432	46	30,942,157	72,838,400	42.48	1,476,241	131,387,502	132,863,743
Arkansas	227	75	72	59	1,123,215	1,390,690	1,231	2,515,136	33,616,000	7.48	6,248,533	32,109,381	38,357,914
California	800	58	58	150	39,946,071	1,004,885	8,538	40,959,494	99,617,280	41.12	28,342,167	319,956,791	348,298,958
Colorado	326	63	62	55	22,073,138	744,574	76	22,817,788	66,341,120	34.39	5,398,187	65,352,680	70,650,867
Connecticut	138	8	8	48		429	305	734	3,084,800	.02	3,524,035	18,127,635	21,651,670
Delaware	70	3	3	14		27,137	9	27,146	1,257,600	2.16	3,620,136	15,158,466	18,778,602
District of Columbia	972			1			11,146	11,146	44,320	25.15	101,461,058	436,784,457	538,245,515
Florida	315	67	66	55	216,609	1,556,135	1,549	1,774,293	35,111,040	5.05	6,123,571	67,888,603	74,012,174
Georgia	317	159	121	95		1,160,350	537	1,160,887	37,584,000	3.09	12,947,934	64,075,274	77,023,208
Idaho	299	44	44	46	31,307,132	1,099,084	822	32,407,038	53,346,560	60.75	4,130,881	56,327,525	60,458,406
Illinois	415	102	97	181		288,406	3,395	291,801	35,867,520	.81	22,694,632	191,140,873	213,835,505
Indiana	229	92	88	108		62,901	355	63,256	23,068,800	.27	5,190,977	39,465,424	44,656,401
Iowa	189	99	90	103		58,121	848	58,969	35,575,040	.17	4,321,557	29,772,352	34,093,909
Kansas	143	105	71	70	25,618	69,046	98	94,762	52,335,360	.18	1,740,674	40,468,927	42,209,601
Kentucky	226	120	95	75		583,545	1,118	584,663	25,715,840	2.27	10,149,324	55,957,078	66,106,402
Louisiana	227	64	56	52	14,566	1,037,738	473	1,052,777	29,061,760	3.62	13,860,495	115,643,948	129,504,443
Maine	220	16	16	66		98,432	1,062	99,494	19,132,800	.52	2,624,853	34,136,019	36,760,872
Maryland	143	24	22	30		124,107	711	124,818	6,362,240	1.96	13,349,269	135,578,180	148,927,449
Massachusetts	281	14	14	108		13,106	2,513	15,619	5,144,960	.03	31,190,233	135,859,379	167,049,612
Michigan	470	83	81	115	122,185	2,169,728	774	2,292,687	36,787,200	.62	13,985,698	68,447,626	82,433,324
Minnesota	246	87	70	79	1,431,377	1,670,143	1,985	3,103,505	51,749,120	6.00	9,975,193	43,901,154	53,876,347
Mississippi	321	82	79	76	9,671	1,234,250	904	1,244,825	29,671,680	4.20	8,906,477	29,373,802	38,280,279
Missouri	289	114	96	93		1,351,233	385	1,351,618	43,985,280	3.07	19,539,941	63,914,048	83,453,989
Montana	381	56	56	35	24,927,361	1,760,697	53	26,688,111	93,523,840	28.54	7,040,929	119,395,653	126,436,582
Nebraska	148	93	68	48	259,216	197,827	182	457,225	49,157,120	.93	2,782,747	22,178,813	24,961,560
Nevada	158	17	17	13	54,960,302	119,685	28	55,080,015	70,285,440	78.37	948,179	72,998,687	73,946,866
New Hampshire	56	10	10	27		668,233	69	668,302	5,779,840	11.56	6,111,857	5,941,514	12,053,371
New Jersey	270	21	20	100		26,693	604	27,297	4,808,960	.57	11,237,652	84,003,663	95,241,315
New Mexico	231	31	31	17	24,970,692	1,388,399	35	26,359,126	78,401,920	33.62	3,191,170	53,493,280	56,684,450
New York	638	62	61	198		87,240	5,435	92,675	30,498,560	.30	80,110,844	302,549,301	382,660,145
North Carolina	275	100	89	89		1,469,302	366	1,469,668	31,193,600	4.71	19,380,121	62,919,283	82,299,404
North Dakota	179	53	48	30	194,564	769,119	304	963,987	44,917,120	2.15	4,287,716	9,202,109	13,489,825
Ohio	393	88	88	160		91,463	1,199	92,662	26,073,600	.36	18,206,648	109,971,645	128,178,293
Oklahoma	239	77	73	69	171,240	245,850	136	417,226	44,424,960	.94	4,661,057	32,086,011	36,747,068
Oregon	384	36	36	44	26,629,080	795,965	168	27,425,213	61,188,480	44.82	7,649,130	113,811,909	121,461,039
Pennsylvania	429	67	63	208		520,075	2,406	522,481	28,692,480	1.82	27,790,998	153,833,611	181,624,609
Rhode Island	69	5	5	16		10,039	56	10,095	682,880	1.48	2,245,034	18,324,540	20,569,574
South Carolina	177	46	44	46		719,069	98	719,167	19,516,800	3.68	6,835,336	37,214,166	44,049,502
South Dakota	127	69	53	29	1,762,786	545,728	20	2,308,534	49,195,520	4.69	3,127,759	18,710,580	21,838,339
Tennessee	468	95	92	120		1,095,131	2,814	1,097,945	26,679,680	4.12	43,838,607	164,245,991	208,084,598
Texas	514	254	167	171		910,416	3,495	913,911	167,934,720	.54	15,528,953	116,292,830	131,821,783
Utah	249	29	29	30	35,565,121	200,123	120	35,765,364	52,597,760	68.00	2,443,281	33,808,811	36,252,092
Vermont	73	14	12	28		168,671	33	168,704	5,839,360	2.89	2,245,826	7,673,317	9,919,143
Virginia	366	100	85	72		1,612,365	2,762	1,615,127	25,767,680	6.27	34,770,505	209,180,370	243,950,875
Washington	418	39	39	67	10,413,076	669,324	3,469	11,085,869	42,775,040	25.92	8,627,433	163,999,367	172,626,800
West Virginia	152	55	45	63		905,223	556	905,779	15,374,080	5.89	7,337,234	63,159,033	70,496,267
Wisconsin	320	71	67	105	14,960	1,479,518	2,581	1,497,059	35,363,840	4.23	9,060,711	46,775,683	55,836,394
Wyoming	202	23	23	35	28,219,256	319,226	1,112	28,539,594	62,430,720	45.71	1,761,657	55,005,491	56,767,148
Total	14,338	3,071			334,987,431	33,760,106	68,752	368,816,289	1,903,221,280	19.38[2]	691,524,231	[2] 4,409,771,729	[2] 5,101,295,960

[1] Federal Works Agency computations.

[2] Does not include cost of public domain.

FREEDOM

Let me close my observations on the same note with which they began—the note of freedom which is the very essence of a sound stable, sturdy prosperous agriculture. It is quite in point to direct your attention to a notice which reached my desk this morning, signed by five Members of the House. They announce a meeting this afternoon at 3 o'clock in the Agricultural Committee room.

The subjects for discussion will be (1) the threat that farmers' sons will be recommended for draft unless they sign up for the triple A; (2) the threat to deny them gasoline unless they sign up for the triple A; and (3) the suing of farmers in the United States district courts in connection with the unconstitutional penalty tax.

It is no great tribute by Government to the patriot farmers of the country, who work long, hard hours, who buy bonds, who surrender their sons for military service, who carry on that you and I, the men in the services in all the far-flung corners of the earth may have subsistence, that those who are engaged with us in this gigantic war effort may have subsistence, that some officer of Government should say, "Unless you sign up for a program, we will take your boy, or we will not give you gasoline." That is not a happy testimony to freedom. Something must be done about it. That is the responsibility of us in the legislative branch. May we not fail in our responsibility to the freedom-loving people of the country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In connection with the letter the gentleman has just read, may I say that I have in my files in my office a copy of a letter written by a draft board which says to a farmer, "You must report and join the triple A within 5 days or we will classify you I-A for military service."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the gentleman will make some comment to the House on that, because it is vital.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I add a word to what I have already said, that Paderewski never played upon the piano with greater skill than this gentleman from Illinois plays upon the heart strings and the imagination of the people who hear him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I fortunately came into this Committee just as my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] began his speech. I enjoyed very much the splendid presentation he has made in respect to the bill which is now before the Committee. I always enjoy hearing our distinguished colleague make a speech. I often find myself ready to agree with his viewpoint about many matters.

I have been a Member of this House for 20 years and I have heard a great many able debates here. I recognize that during my service here there have been many outstanding students in this body and I always listen with great pleasure to their scholarly addresses. I make no mistake when I assert that our distinguished colleague from Illinois who has just addressed the Committee is one of the outstanding debaters who have been here in the 20 years in which I have been in Congress. He is one of the best students, in my opinion, who has adorned this House at any time, and certainly one of the most intellectual men we have had here in a number of years. This is what I think of him and this is how I apprise the statements he makes in this body. His fellow Members are always glad to hear him because he is an outstanding Member of our great body.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague for the compliment he has just paid one of my constituents on this floor. I have made it the purpose of my life to say nice things about people. I often look back over my life and enjoy the nice things I have said about my friends. I never intend to breach this habit. The gentleman from Illinois has just spoken of a constituent of mine, Mr. F. W. Boswell, of Wilson County, N. C., who came here a modest, genuine farmer, and appeared before his committee recently. Mr. Boswell came into my office, and I did not realize what he was doing in Washington. He is a busy man at home and has always been a busy man. He is a man who has had the respect and the confidence of the people in his county and throughout the whole State of North Carolina. Several times the able people in the county in which he resides have sent him to the Legislature of North Carolina because of his practical sense, his fine characteristics, and his successful career in life.

I was glad that he had come here to speak to our subcommittee in respect to this important soil conservation program, which he says, and which I believe, is one of the outstanding and most wonderful things we have done here in the last 50 years. Mr. Boswell deserves the compliment paid him by my distinguished colleague from Illinois. I want this House to know that he is an intimate friend of mine and has been for many years and I consider him one of the best citizens and one of the outstanding men in my great State.

I deeply appreciate the splendid reception given Mr. Boswell by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, when he appeared before this committee, and the comments of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, made and other members of the committee in respect to Mr. Boswell's appearance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I always dislike to disagree with my friends of the subcommittee for agricultural appropriations, but I do take exception to their action this year in suggesting the immediate liquidation of the guayule emergency rubber project. I am glad to note that my friend from Illinois, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. DIRKSEN, is a little bit disturbed over the action that has been taken. I hope that other members of the subcommittee will find that their conscience also bothers them just a little bit, because I think the action recommended in this bill is a long step backward in what might have proved to be a very forward-looking program. As soon as I learned of the action that had been suggested by the committee, I called the office of the Rubber Director, Mr. Bradley Dewey. Mr. Dewey said to me that he was horrified. I said, "Don't you think they have taken the uneconomic way out of this question?" He said, "I do not see that economics enters into it so much," but he added, "Does not someone believe in a rubber insurance program?"

Yesterday morning in testifying before the Poage subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, Mr. Dewey submitted a memorandum in connection with the present status of the emergency rubber program and he closed with this warning note, which I should like to read into the RECORD. He said:

I do not take any position on guayule as a commercial post-war crop, but as Rubber Director I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I were to allow to pass without protest a decision that at this time would liquidate any supplies of crude rubber, whether growing in American fields or in warehouses.

I was interested to hear the distinguished gentleman from Illinois state that in this bill is contained $48,000,000 for research. Well, if the domestic production of rubber from guayule is not an important research activity, what would you call it?

I think most of the Members of the House will recall that only a short time ago, we authorized the appropriation of $30,000,000 to develop fuel oil from coal and shale and other sources. I wonder how many hundreds of millions of dollars we have appropriated for the development of synthetic rubber. It seems to me particularly short-sighted at this time to do away entirely with the program which consists of approximately 30,000 tons of potential rubber now growing in the United States.

Let us look briefly at the history of the entire guayule program. The bill was signed by the President on March 5, 1942, just a little over 2 years ago. That authorization contained a provision for the planting of 75,000 acres in the United States. That was later amended to 500,000 acres following the favorable report of the Baruch committee, which recommended the expansion of the project. The Forest Service started taking over some valuable food-crop land in our

Western States and ran squarely into our emergency food program. The Rubber Director and the Secretary of Agriculture curtailed the program, and we now have growing in the United States approximately 33,000 acres of guayule shrub.

Now it was carefully explained to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and it was most thoroughly explained to the House of Representatives when the bill was first presented, that we could not expect an immediate supply of rubber from guayule, that it takes a period of time to grow, that the most economic time for harvesting it is after 4 or 5 years in the field. But why at this particular time, with rubber as short as it is and with our crude rubber inventory falling annually, we should destroy the potential 30,000 tons of rubber now growing is utterly incomprehensible to me.

In this connection I would like to quote from a letter which I just received from the Director of this program, Mr. C. M. Granger, of the United States Forest Service. He submits several plans for liquidating the project over varying periods of years, and I shall insert his letter at this point.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 21, 1944.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: In response to your letter of March 20 concerning the guayule project, I am glad to provide you the following information.

The estimate of $5,420,000 for fiscal year 1945 submitted to Congress by the Budget Bureau provided for erection of one new mill in the Bakersfield area; operating that mill and the Salinas mill during the harvest season of 1944–45 to produce an estimated 700 tons of rubber; maintenance of the remaining approximately 29,000 acres of existing plantations for future harvesting; and continuance of research on producing guayule shrub and processing it into rubber, with a view to probable completion of research in fiscal year 1945. Since Congress last December denied funds for an expansion of the project, the Rubber Director informally asked the Department to prepare a program of liquidation of existing plantations which would produce the maximum quantity of rubber at the lowest net cost per pound. This was done, as follows:

Fiscal year	Harvest, acres	Rubber production, long tons	Estimated cost
1945	2,587	720	$5,470,000
1946	3,915	3,067	4,857,000
1947	4,880	4,468	3,410,000
1948	4,585	5,009	2,996,000
1949	4,311	5,280	2,663,000
1950	6,113	5,569	2,528,000
1951	5,549	4,825	2,178,000
Estimated total rubber production		28,938	
Estimated total cost, fiscal years 1945–51			24,104,000
Estimated cost, fiscal years 1942–44			33,049,331
Total			57,153,331

Under this plan it is estimated there would be an approximate salvage value of $5,000,000 in improvements and equipment, and a realization from the sale of 64,822,000 pounds of rubber at 27 cents per pound of $17,501,940, which combined would provide a credit of $22,501,940 against the estimated total outlay for the project, including liquidation, of $57,153,331, making net cost of 53 cents per pound of rubber.

If it were decided to harvest all shrub in the next 2 years, as a means of quick liquidation instead of plowing up the shrub, it is estimated that it would require nine large new mills to be designed at once and erected as rapidly as possible. The additional cost of liquidation under this plan during the 2-year period is estimated at approximately $22,000,000. About 10,000 long tons of rubber might be produced. Allowing for a salvage of $5,000,000 and receipts from the sale of rubber of $6,048,000, the net estimated expenditures not recoverable for the entire guayule project would be approximately $43,892,700, or $1.96 per pound for the rubber produced.

The project has already produced about 613 tons of rubber from old shrub at Salinas, and Texas wild shrub which has been sold to Rubber Reserve Company.

The estimated total amount of rubber which would be produced by the project if the liquidation plan favored by the Rubber Director were adopted would be equivalent to the quantity used in making 5,400,000 ordinary (600 by 16) passenger-car tires.

Very sincerely yours,
LYLE F. WATTS,
Chief.
By C. M. GRANGER.

Now, let me quote one paragraph:

Under this plan it is estimated there would be an approximate salvage value of $5,000,000 in improvements and equipment and a realization from the sale of 64,822,000 pounds of rubber at 27 cents per pound of $17,501,940, which combined would provide a credit of $22,501,940 against the estimated total outlay for the project, including liquidation, of $57,153,331, making the net cost 53 cents a pound for rubber.

May I respectfully invite your attention to the fact that today we are paying 63 cents a pound for rubber imported from South America.

So far we have spent approximately $33,000,000 during the fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944. The Forest Service requests $22,000,000 additional for the 7-year liquidation program. If the project is to be liquidated let us do it in a manner that will bring some sort of a return on our investment. We should not plow these 33,000 acres under. Let us produce it. Let us go through an orderly process of liquidation and find out whether or not it is possible for our farmers to produce this in the post-war world. Why liquidate a research program that has been so well established up to the present date? As the chairman of the committee stated yesterday, we have already refined 613 tons of rubber from approximately 500 acres of old shrub in California and some wild shrub in Texas.

Now, who endorsed this program? What Government agencies were interested in the emergency rubber program? The House did not have to accept my statement in connection with this, but they did accept the statements of interested Federal agencies. The Department of Commerce endorsed it. The United States Tariff Commission endorsed it. The Navy Department endorsed it. The Big Four—General Rubber Co., Goodrich Rubber Co., Goodyear Rubber Co. and the Firestone Rubber Co. endorsed it. The Bureau of the Budget gave it its approval. The Department of Agriculture endorsed it. The Committee on Agriculture endorsed it and reported it to the House and it was passed and signed by the President.

There is one more report which I should like to call to the attention of the House, because I do not want them to accept my statements on this as a rubber expert. I do not claim to be a rubber expert.

Back in 1930, when this country was beginning to worry a little bit about the fact that it was entirely dependent for rubber on sources far removed in the western Pacific, then Maj. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Maj. Gilbert Van B. Willkes, of the United States Army, conducted a thorough investigation of guayule production in Mexico, Texas, and California. Following the report that they filed, nothing was done. That was unfortunate as time and experience have shown. I would like to quote briefly several paragraphs from the recommendations made by General Eisenhower, who is now leading our forces in England. He said, in part, as follows:

The Government might be interested in encouraging the guayule industry in the United States in view of:

The opportunity to build up a domestic source of supply for rubber so that in a grave emergency we would not be wholly dependent on southeast Asia and the adjoining islands for this important raw material.

The opportunity to build up a domestic source of supply of rubber so that American consumers would have some protection against possible commercial combines between the great rubber producing companies of the Far East.

The possibility of building up an industry in the United States that would give profitable employment to some thousands of American farmers, mechanics, and laborers. We send some two to three hundred million dollars annually to foreign countries to pay for rubber which we import.

And, I might add, we pay the price they set because we have no lever here at home to pry with when it comes to negotiating.

Another point raised by General Eisenhower is as follows:

The precarious position of the United States in depending entirely on the continued health of hevea trees in the Middle East now producing 96 percent of the world's supply of rubber.

Adding even 10 percent to the total annual supply of rubber by means of cultivated guayule would mean much lower prices for the remaining 90 percent, with the United States, as a consuming country, greatly benefited.

Mr. Chairman, when the original bill authorizing this project was before the House, I made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position on this subject absolutely clear to every Member of the House. I would still be urging the adoption of this legislation if there was no war on and if our supply of rubber from the East Indies had not been threatened. In my opinion it is extremely unwise for the United States to continue to ignore the possibility of producing a certain percentage of the rubber it needs within its own borders. We are completely at the mercy of an international rubber cartel, a rubber monopoly, and in spite of the cost of produc-

tion of imported rubber this monopoly sets the price and we pay it.

In spite of all reports to the contrary, I cannot share the beautiful optimism of those who say that we are not going to be kicked out of the southwest Pacific, and our rubber is going to continue to arrive. There is no Member of the House that I give way to in my desire to settle this issue in the southwest Pacific just as soon as possible and get back our natural supply of rubber as soon as possible, but at the same time I think that as long as this guayule plan presents an avenue of securing an additional supply of natural rubber, we should take advantage of it.

I still think that was pretty good logic.

One last point in General Eisenhower's report which I hope you will all listen to carefully. This was in 1930:

At present no one believes that the United States will, in this or the next generation, produce annually the major part of the rubber we consume. But if the guayule industry could develop to the point where approximately 400,000 acres were devoted to the growth of guayule we would produce annually almost 160,000,000 pounds of rubber and have in reserve at all times not less than 250,000,000 pounds. The existence of these conditions would in the event of a war where our overseas communications were interrupted be of inestimable value to the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The recommendations I have quoted are not my personal opinions. They are the opinions of men who have gone into this subject thoroughly and carefully over a period of many years. It seems to me to be a particularly short-sighted policy for us at this time to eliminate this splendid research program. I do not intend to offer an amendment to this bill. The responsibility for discontinuing the emergency rubber project rests with the committee. However, I do hope that at the other end of the Capitol, at a later date, and as a result of investigations now under way, this very vital program will be reinstated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

CABINET MEMBERS IN CONGRESS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, St. Paul tells us that the Athenians congregated daily at the Areopagus on Mars' Hill "to hear and to tell some new thing." That interest, that passion for something new has continued down through the ages to the present day. It is fortunate that it has, for without it progress would have been slow if not impossible. That is particularly true of systems of government. No day is complete without suggestions of some new thing in governmental structure or procedure. In every Congress—from the First to the Seventy-eighth—resolutions have been introduced, and propositions submitted orally, for amendment or revision of the Rules of the House. And all improvements in the rules, and in House procedure, have resulted from such resolutions and suggestions.

The latest—and the most important proposed in recent years—is the resolution introduced by Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, establishing procedure under which, periodically, invitations would be extended to Cabinet members and heads of Government agencies to appear before the House of Representatives for questioning.

In brief, the plan provides for a question period at least once every fortnight, but not oftener than once a week, at which heads of departments and independent agencies would be invited to attend and answer questions propounded by Members of the House. The date and duration of the periods would be determined by the Committee on Rules and the time would be equally divided between written and oral questions. The written questions would be reviewed and submitted by the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter and issuing the invitation and would be printed in advance in two daily editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The oral questions would be submitted from the floor by Members of the House in time controlled equally by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee extending the invitation.

The purpose of this rather drastic—and to some extent iconoclastic—innovation, and the benefits sought to be secured, are the establishment of a closer relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, the diffusion of more accurate and authoritative information on governmental affairs, both in the Congress and the country at large, the conservation of the time of executives and legislators and the better administration and control of departmental activity and expenditure.

It is argued that while the plan may not perhaps be considered a sovereign remedy for all governmental and parliamentary ills, it will at least be productive of no particularly disqualifying evils, and that it may embody possibilities of great potential advantage.

The resolution is painstakingly prepared and admirably framed, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is to be commended on his constructive proposal and its scholarly presentation. He has rendered a distinct service in bringing it to an issue.

The proposal has aroused widespread interest. It has been editorially reviewed by practically every metropolitan newspaper and radio commentator in the country. It has been sympathetically debated in the House and numerous magazine articles and newspaper editorials have been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In a Gallup-poll survey 72 percent of the representative citizens questioned favored the proposal, and an inconsequential number opposed it. Few proposals in recent years have met with such general and generous consideration and approval by students of government and the political writers of the day. In all the Nation-wide editorial comment on the resolution there is not a single sentence of criticism or dissent. In the debate on the floor of the House, although the resolution might well be considered a highly mooted question, no opposition has been expressed and no controversial issues have been raised. It has met everywhere with universal acquiescence and acclaim.

The experience and practice of the British House of Commons, however, so frequently cited in support of the proposition, is not in point. There are fundamental and organic differences between the American and English systems of government which render many of the practices of one inapplicable to the other. The question period is one of them. In England the Cabinet is wholly independent of the Crown, whereas under our Government the Cabinet is a mere appendage of the Presidency, appointed by the Executive, subject to direction or dismissal at any time, and without authority to speak for the administration. The members of the British Cabinet are members of Parliament and exercise both legislative and administrative authority. The American Cabinet is per se without either. There the Cabinet, while the creature of the House of Commons, and holding office at the pleasure of that body, dominates the Parliament, acts as a steering committee, lays out the agenda, appoints the standing committees, controls all major legislation, and rules the nation. Under such a system, the right to question on the floor and, by vote of lack of confidence, to dismiss the ministry is a vital and indispensable part of governmental machinery.

On the contrary, under our own form of government, the question period does not conform to parliamentary requirements and is not only unneeded but would be disruptive and dangerous.

Congress already has authority and machinery with which to secure any needed information from the departments and has other and better adapted methods and more efficient agencies at hand than any which would be afforded by the proposed question period.

First. The resolution of inquiry, in use since the beginning of the Republic and codified in 1820 is specifically designed to serve precisely the purpose for which the question period is proposed. Under this rule—section 5 of rule XXII—any Member of the House may submit a resolution requesting information from the head of any of the executive departments and the committee having jurisdiction is required to report it within 1 week—less time than would be required to bring a Cabinet member to the floor under the pending resolution. If the committee refuses or neglects to report it within the 7 days or reports it adversely, a motion to discharge the committee is privileged. Such resolutions invariably elicit the information requested. Even the President himself, although exempted where the information requested is "incompatible with the public welfare" has usually complied with the request even to the transmittal of minutes of Cabinet meetings, data which could not be obtained under any circumstances during the proposed question period.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In just a moment.

The resolution of inquiry is a drastic instrument and is effective under conditions to which the question period would not apply. It is the equivalent of the question hour under the English system.

The right to request information from the executive departments is one of the important prerogatives of the House. This carefully preserved right of the House to interrogate the executive branch of the Government obviates the necessity of Cabinet members appearing on the floor to give information as in the House of Commons (III, 1879–83; BI, 432). (Procedure in the House of Representatives, p. 205.)

I now yield to my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am deeply interested in what my colleague from Missouri says. According to his statement, information is immediately forthcoming under the system he outlines. As far as I am concerned, I have been ever since last October trying to find out what the hay subsidy is in two States. While I get all kinds of information I do not get the information I asked for.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman would take advantage of the means at his command and introduce a resolution of inquiry requesting the information today they could not deny him the data requested 1 week from today. If the gentleman asks the information and it is information we should have I would be glad to cooperate with him in securing the passage of the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thought the gentleman, being chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—and since this bill has an appropriation in it for that department—I thought it would be an easier matter just to take it up with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that possibly he would be glad to get it for me. Was I right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman should take advantage of the facilities at hand. He is one of the leading Members of the House and will have no difficulty. I shall be glad to cooperate.

Mr. Chairman, by way of recapitulation, the instrumentalities of inquiry and investigation are:

First. Resolutions of inquiry, which I have just discussed.

Second. The standing committees, in which the real work of the Congress is done, offer every facility for securing information. They regularly and habitually call the Cabinet officers, and other officers of the Government, before them for inquiry and interrogation. They have the advantage over any inquiry which might be instituted through a question period of eliciting information on military and other secret and confidential subjects which could not be divulged on the floor. Whereas the proposed question period is limited to 2 hours and the questions to subjects approved by the committee having jurisdiction, the standing and select committees of the House and Senate are subject to no limitation either as to time or material. It is only necessary to consult the printed hearings of the committees of the House and Senate to read in detail the testimony of any member of the Cabinet on practically any question with which his department is concerned. It is impossible to imagine any more thorough or searching inquiries than those conducted by the Kilgore, Tolan, Dies, or Truman committees, or by the House Committee on Appropriations with its indefectible and unerring staff of investigators to supplement and verify any testimony adduced. In answer to the singularly unconvincing suggestion that executives are required to spend too much of their valuable time before committees and are called before more than one committee on the same subject, the truth is that they frequently welcome a second invitation as affording them an opportunity for rebuttal. And if there should be grounds for such complaint, it would apply with equal force to those called before the House for question periods, as witness the protest by Prime Minister Churchill to Parliament:

I must ask the House to realize the enormous burdens falling upon me, not by my work as Minister of Defense, but by repeated and constant attendance on this House, which I never expected I should have to face, but which I will face.

So onerous were these demands upon Mr. Churchill's time that eventually Secretary Cripps was drafted to relieve the Prime Minister of this task.

Third. Insofar as the general public, so frequently referred to in debate and editorial comment in this connection, are concerned, the regular press conferences of the President, and of the heads of departments, comprise the American substitute for the British parliamentary question period and are a much more effective medium for disseminating information. The average American reporter has no peer as an interlocutor and can be depended upon to extract information where many a ponderous parliamentary potentate would fail ingloriously.

Fourth. A peculiarly American instrumentality is the freedom of intimate personal contact with American officialdom. Any Member of Congress may see the President at will and heads of departments and other agencies welcome such visitors or are available by telephone or will call at the office of Congressmen on request. The House and Senate leaders hold weekly conferences at the White House and any information which any department is in position to supply is at the command of any Member in the discharge of his official duties.

Fifth. And last, but comprehensive and authoritative, each governmental department and agency issues periodical and special reports carrying voluminous information on its work and will, if occasion requires, issue supplemental reports which are available to all sincere searchers after legislative and administrative knowledge.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the transfer of legislation or investigation from one committee to another. Did the gentleman ever try to get a piece of legislation once referred to a committee transferred to another committee that had more appropriate jurisdiction?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say that perhaps I fail to understand the question of my colleague from Idaho. Apparently it does not relate to a question of inquiry. But if it does we have a score of special committees investigating almost every question subject to investigation. And if none of them are considering the particular matter in which my friend is interested further committees can be authorized to make inquiries.

If anybody can think of anything that has not been investigated, we will investigate it. As a matter of fact, I sometimes think it is about time for somebody to investigate the investigators.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield further to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Let me tell the gentleman what has been happening. In the House within the last 2 days a bill dealing with about $50,000,000 worth of forest land under the Department of Agriculture, was placed before the Committee on Agriculture, it was bypassed around the Committee on Public Lands, that has made a study of this matter and knows something about it. It was passed out of the Agricultural Committee, where the members are worked to death. It comes in here and is passed through the House without anybody knowing a great deal about it. What kind of legislation is that? I am talking about S. 150.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman has slept on his rights.

The institution of a question hour in House procedure would be of no value. It could not supply even a modicum of the information already available through the facilities now at the command of any Member of Congress. On the other hand, it would involve disadvantages and of the most serious nature.

It is unnecessary to discuss here the grave implications in the changed constitutional relations between the executive and legislative branches of the Government resulting, or calculated to result, from the tentative abandonment of the traditional doctrine of the separation of powers laid down in the Constitution and the proposed fusion of legislative and executive direction provided in this radical innovation in our system of government. But it should be noted that while the members of the Cabinet could not be summoned without consent of the President, the pressure of public sentiment would be such as to override any objections he might feel justified in interposing and the invitations of the House to the members of the President's official family would, in effect, amount to an arbitrary direction to the executive branch to attend upon the wishes of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Aside from such complications, the forced attendance of Cabinet officers on the will of the House—for that is what it would amount to—could not fail to

result in strained relations between the two branches of government. Such a question hour would degenerate immediately and inevitably into a political fencing match. Nothing would be so calculated to arouse bitter controversy as the selection of the questions to be asked, and when in the last half of the period the inquiry was thrown open to a round table in which all Members were free to participate, the Sergeant at Arms would have to recruit a special force to preserve order between the Members of the House, and the Members and the President's representative. While the resolution apparently takes every precaution, possible precaution, to keep the inquiry on a high plane of statesmanship, and committees of the House are required to sanction the formal questions to be submitted in the first half of the period, anyone even casually acquainted with the House and its membership knows that from the first hour the device would be used for partisan political advantage. Would the questions submitted from the floor relate to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the administration of Indian Affairs or the extent of the victory in the South Pacific or the advantages of social security? Well, hardly. They would probe excruciatingly into the depths of the rawest nerve centers of current campaign issues. It requires no effort of the imagination to visualize certain Members—readily brought to mind—inquiring about prominent characters featured in the political cartoons of the day and their personal and private foibles. On the only occasion on which he appeared on the floor of the Senate, President Washington was so deliberately, gratuitously and cavalierly insulted that he left in high dudgeon and never returned. If august Members of the upper body so flagrantly offended the Father of his Country at the close of the War for Independence, and in his first administration, could each of the 435 Members of the House be expected to treat Cabinet envoys with special and indulgent consideration? If Members said personally to Cabinet members when they appeared here the same things they say about them daily on the floor, it would probably be necessary to call out the guard. Always there are members of every party and every parliamentary body who cannot be restrained. Controversies would be engendered which would bring friends to the defense and foes to the attack and the result would be bedlam and pandemonium. It would give rise to bad taste, bad manners, and bad blood. Such a plan would disturb the warm spirit of amity existing across the aisle of the House. Instead of bringing about better teamwork between the Congress and the executive departments, it would drive a wedge of discord between the legislative and executive branches of the Government and controversies kindled in the question hour would spread through the Nation until they involved the remotest cross-road hamlet in the country.

Furthermore, the mechanical difficulties of such a plan are insuperable. The question period would fill the galleries, feature the newspapers and radio broadcasts, and precipitate field days in Congress. No Member would feel that he was discharging his duties as a leading Member of the House in the eyes of his constituency unless he was participating prominently in the proceedings. It would be a poor Member indeed who could not think up a $64 question to woo the limelight of publicity—especially in campaign years. The result would be traffic jams on the floor unprecedented in the history of the Congress.

It naturally follows that the committees would be required to devote a large amount of time to the consideration of the flood of questions which would pour in upon them for review. The Committee on Rules in addition to its already onerous duties would be swamped with the necessity of making allotments of time, determining priorities, setting dates and durations of periods. The routine of the Cabinet itself would be materially disturbed. There would be constant communications relative to invitations, negotiating acceptances, and preparing for the ordeal of the floor. The President would be reduced to the necessity of selecting his Cabinet officers on a basis of controversial repartee rather than statesmanship and would have to choose between executives and exhorters. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be further burdened in carrying approved questions for two issues in advance and voluminous reports of proceedings transpiring during the question period. The periods would necessarily monopolize time on the most crowded days of the week and further complicate the already congested program of the House.

But the most significant commentary on the widely advertised proposal is its antiquity. It is as old as the House itself. It has risen to challenge the attention of statesmen in every generation since the founding of the Republic. It was considered by the framers of the Constitution and rejected. It has been proposed either orally or by resolution in practically every Congress since Washington. The fact that all through the years it has been repeatedly and consistently rejected, is in itself conclusive evidence of its failure to conform to the needs of our parliamentary system. It would solve no problems. It would question appointive officers who cannot commit anybody to anything. It would divert the attention of legislators and executives from important work. It invites interparty and intraparty dissension, provokes endless annoyance, involves fruitless complications and would be accompanied by a huge wastage of time. It is impracticable, obstructive, and unworkable and should be buried, once for all, so deeply in the limbo of the past that columnists and commentators will never again be able to disinter its moldering bones to parade them as trappings of a vehicle in which to criticize the legislative branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, in his speech at the food forum on March 15 the gentleman from Kansas, Representative HOPE, paid just tribute to the war efforts of the American farmer. As one who grew up on a small farm and whose parents now live alone on one. I take just pride in what American farmers have done and are doing. No class of civilians has done more with less or under greater difficulties.

During 1942, 13.6 percent of our food production went for military purposes and for lend-lease. During 1943, 25 percent of our food production went for this purpose. Yet during both of these years our civilian population on the whole was better fed than ever before in their lives. The farmer has received little publicity or acclaim because his activities are of the less spectacular sort. Each year since the beginning of the war program the farmer has increased his total output. He has done this notwithstanding the increasing cost and scarcity of farm machinery and of farm labor. Between the years 1939 and 1943 total farm production increased 21 percent and food production increased 24 percent. In a 3-year period from 1940 to 1943 2,600,000 actual or potential farm workers left the farm and more than a million others took nonfarm jobs while continuing to live on the farm. These persons who left the farms for military service or skilled employment were, on the whole, the younger and more able-bodied members of the farm community. Yet those remaining have carried on, meeting food production quotas, increasing acreage, planting crops in many cases for which they had poor equipment and with which they had little experience, simply because they were requested to do so.

From 1939 to 1943 we increased our oilseed crops 145 percent. Production of beef cattle increased 27 percent. The production of pork increased 68 percent. During 1943 the allotment of material for farm machinery was only 40 percent of the production of 1940, yet the farmer received only a fractional part of that allotment. During the year 1944 the allotment of material for farm machinery is 80 percent of the 1940 output, but already we know the farmer will receive only a fractional part of the machinery contemplated. Notwithstanding his lack of priority in the procurement of suitable machinery, notwithstanding his transportation and labor shortages, the farmer will in 1944 break our crop record of 364,000,000 acres by many additional millions, and if Providence is kind in the matter of weather he will break the already all-time high record of food production set during these war years.

This cannot be kept up indefinitely without better cooperation from the Government.

Many of these farms have no one remaining on them except unemployable persons, the very old and the very young. Many of these farms are cultivated by aged persons whose shoulders are stooped from years of toil, whose eyes are dim, who suffer from rheumatism and other diseases of declining years. Yet, through patriotism and a sense of duty they carry on. Instead of 8 hours per day they work from 10 to 16 hours a day. Instead of a 40-hour week they work from 60 to 75 hours a week.

Mr. Chairman, many times during my brief service in this Congress I have contended that farmers should be assured not only parity prices for their products, but parity income with industry and labor. During the parity period, 1909–14, the per capita farm income averaged $134, compared with nonfarm income of $483 per capita. In 1941 the per capita income of farmers was $237 as compared with $825 for nonfarmers. This unfavorable income ratio has continued. There is no just basis for such great disparity.

Mr. Chairman, within the next few days we are going to pass through this Congress two bills of great importance to the American farmer and to our entire food-production program. One is the agriculture appropriation bill we are today debating, the other is a bill continuing the Office of Price Administration. I opposed the last O. P. A. bill because, among other ways in which it discriminated against farmers, it refused to permit labor costs to be figured into the parity formula and restricted the floor under farm products to 90 percent of the old parity formula.

Mr. Chairman, fairness and self-interest demand for the American farmer better legislation and better administration in his efforts to sustain himself and meet food-production goals.

(Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I am always pleased to listen to the distinguished young man from Illinois who is on this subcommittee and who made his statement about a half hour ago. I am certainly pleased also with all the positions he takes on agricultural legislation.

There is going to be a meeting of Republicans in Chicago on the 26th of June. This gentleman lives down at Pekin, which is only 156 miles away. I think the folks who will meet in Chicago might go farther and fare worse than travel down that 156 miles, pick up this distinguished statesman from Pekin and name him for the highest place in the councils of this Nation.

I am also much pleased and thankful to this committee and the chairman of it who has been so diligent and who makes his case so plain to us that there remains with us scarcely any criticism of the bill. The gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, has done great things for agriculture.

I am also pleased this year to find that the bill and the report upon it was ready to put into our hands several days before we had to commence to discuss it on the floor and vote upon it. It was not so 1 year ago, and I complained somewhat at that time. It is not done with the other appropriation bills, or at least some of them, and it certainly is right that the bill should be before us in sufficient time that we can read it before we commence to discuss it on the floor and vote upon it.

On yesterday I interrogated the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, about the Commodity Credit Corporation, especially as to the making of loans upon grain and crops stored upon the farms. He informed me that the Commodity Credit Corporation had run behind about 95 percent of its capital, and I want to say that it also has the right to borrow money from the R. F. C., some $3,000,000,000 worth, and that it can make loans upon the grain, wheat, corn, cotton, and so on, out of what it borrows from the R. F. C., and it will lose nothing. Its losses are almost wholly attributable to the fact that they are allowed to buy wheat, paying the full price for wheat over in Kansas where they raise it and then bring it over and sell it at a loss to feeders, or sell it to the East to feeders. They do the same thing with the wheat that comes up from the Argentine.

The told me this morning that they had bought wheat down in the Argentine at a cost of $225,000 and the freight was $125,000, and that they lost a great deal of money in bringing it up here and selling it to the feeders, the eastern feeders, the chicken feeders, and all that.

I do not know that I am objecting so much to that, but I do object to attributing this loss to the farmers of the wheat and corn country. It is not their fault that Commodity Credit is losing money. It is because they go down in other places, and into the Argentine, and buy wheat and then sell it at a loss. Oh, how we ought to love the Argentine that has little sympathy for the United States of America and its allies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Soybeans is a thing I want to talk about for a moment. We cannot get a price for soybeans so that the farmers of our State can afford to raise them. They have asked the farmers in my part of the country to raise soybeans, and state that this is necessary to the war effort. I suppose our farmers will do it, even though they lose money by it. Two of them told me they would, because of their patriotism and because they have boys in the Army. Do you not know that for every acre upon which they raise these soybeans they lose about $20, because they can make that much more by the raising of corn. We ought to raise, and the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to raise, the floor on soybeans up to $2.50 anyway in order to make it comparable with the price we can get for our corn.

There are many things in this bill that I would like to talk about. I do not find affirmative fault with the bill itself. If there is any fault to be found, it is a fault of omission and not of commission, because everything in the bill appears to be very good, although you might put some things in it that would add to it and improve its quality.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, on March 7 the House eliminated the school-lunch program from the Pace bill, authorizing certain projects heretofore carried in the agricultural bill. I confess that I am quite in accord with the arguments against a broad spread of school lunches just because there are schools and there are school children, but I cannot subscribe to this wholesale elimination of the school-lunch program.

The school-lunch program was inaugurated in 1939 in connection with the surplus disposal of foods and was financed under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Until 1943 the program consisted of the distribution of these surpluses to schools qualifying for assistance. In 1943, because of the disappearance of any substantial surpluses, the program was changed to be largely a reimbursement program. Projects qualifying for Federal assistance during the past year purchased essential supplies in the local market and were reimbursed by the Federal Government. But note that they do have to qualify. Eligible schools and child-care centers make application for the program to the field office of the War Food Administration or to the appropriate State agency. Upon verification of the applicant's eligibility, only nonprofit organizations certifying that they cannot serve an adequate lunch without Federal assistance are really eligible. There may be some schools that might appear to lack essential need as a qualification, but the great majority of them are schools that cannot afford to give the children lunches. So many children come from homes where the mother is working. Before she goes to work in the morning she has little time to give the children a satisfying hot breakfast and to fill their lunch boxes. The result is that those children are pretty hungry children who seldom get any hot meal at all.

About 70 percent of the lunches include milk. Sixty-seven percent of the children participating are getting what they call a type A meal that costs about 5.8 cents a meal.

To many people this may seem just another one of those things where the Federal Government is reaching into the local communities and doing things that the local communities should be doing for themselves. Perhaps that is partly true. But I am a woman, a mother, and a very proud grandmother; I am troubled that we eliminate this program before we know what provisions can be made for those schools where there cannot be school lunches unless there is

some Federal help. Unless we can be assured that the children will not suffer, surely we should not take away all Federal help.

When I was a very little girl I was given a bit of advice and I have found it exceedingly useful and exceedingly steadying. I am sometimes inclined to feel that my way is perhaps the best way and that all other ways must go. Then I am reminded of what I was told long ago. "Never take away something that is serving a constructive, useful, or necessary purpose unless or until you have something better to put in its place."

What have you to put in the place of the school-lunch program?

I cannot but hope that once again the Senate will put the school-lunch program back into the bill, which, I understand, would not make it subject to a point of order. That would give us time to see to it that there is proper enabling legislation to set up methods of control throughout the country to cover the real needs of this very large group of our children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady has definitely painted the picture as far as the House is concerned. It should be understood by everybody that insofar as this subcommittee is concerned, it was powerless to appropriate a cent for this purpose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago I received a number of complaints from the farmers of my district objecting to the fact that they were being compelled to go to the A. A. A. in order to obtain the gasoline necessary to operate their farms. At that time I took the matter up with the Office of Price Administration, and just a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Richard C. Harrison, Chief of the Gasoline Rationing Branch to which he attached a memorandum which was sent out by Mr. Charles F. Phillips, Director of the Automotive Supply Rationing Division, to all regional offices. The letter and the memorandum are as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE AMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1944.

The Honorable J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCGREGOR: Per our telephone conversation today I am enclosing herewith six copies of memorandum which we sent to our regional offices yesterday regarding A. A. A. certification of farmers' gasoline rations.

If I may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD C. HARRISON,
Chief, Gasoline Rationing Branch.

MEMORANDUM

MARCH 15, 1944.

To all regional offices.

From Charles F. Phillips, Director, Automotive Supply Rationing Division.

Subject: A. A. A. certification of farmers' rations.

Recently we have had a good many complaints from farmers and farm groups over A. A. A. certification. The purpose of the tie-up with agriculture was, of course, to provide our boards with information and expert assistance concerning proper gasoline consumption by farmers. But we should not be drawn into any quarrel over A. A. A. If cases arise in which individuals or groups object to A. A. A. certification this objection should be heeded so long as it will not lead to bad rationing. We doubt that objection should arise in many cases since applicants, according to our annotations, are allowed to file with our local boards, and then boards are instructed to refer farmer nonhighway applications to the A. A. A. In any case the annotations will be promptly revised with the above instructions in mind.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the United States has now been at war for nearly 2½ years. During that time we have shown a remarkable ability to produce. We have produced food and war materials for virtually every group of people fighting for the cause of freedom and liberty. Our great production success has been partly due to our ability to get things done quickly and partly to our vast supply of natural resources. It has often been said that wars are caused by the intense desire of nations to acquire the natural resources which they lack. Be that as it may, we know that natural resources are essential in our national economy. Three of our important natural resources are forests, range lands for grazing of livestock, and water supplies. We in the West fully appreciate how vital it is to conserve and efficiently utilize these resources.

Millions of feet of lumber have been used in the prosecution of this war for thousands of different things. Nearly half has been used for crating our vast war supplies for shipment throughout the world. A large amount, too, has gone for constructing cantonments, supply depots, and other establishments, not only in this country but in all parts of the globe. Paper and paper products, too, made from pulpwood, are now listed as critical materials. Many millions more board feet of lumber and cords of pulpwood will be used before this war is over, causing a tremendous drain on the merchantable supply of growing timber. This all emphasizes the necessity of so cutting our forests that a future supply will be assured.

Our capacity to fill the demands of meat, hides, and wool has also been severely taxed but a grand job is being done by our farmers and stockmen. Much of the slaughter has been of grass-fat cattle and lambs coming directly from the ranges of the West. Other animals grown on the western ranges have been fattened in feed lots on our farms before becoming beefsteaks and lamb chops. Continued high livestock production from our range lands is going to be essential during the rest of the war and in the immediate post-war period. When this period of maximum war production has passed, we want to be sure that our range resources are in shape to continue to support the important part of our western population which makes up the western livestock industry.

Food production of all sorts has been at record levels. Vast amounts of this food are produced under irrigation. To irrigation farmers the amount and character of water available and the period of availability are of the first importance. This irrigation water comes chiefly from our forested mountains. Accordingly, the use made of these forests directly affects the irrigation farmer.

Research is the basis for efficient management and use of these resources. The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, through its series of regional forest and range experiment stations and the forest-products laboratory, is conducting the necessary research to furnish principles and practices underlying efficient production, harvesting, and utilization of the wood, forage, and water produced on forest lands.

At Fort Collins, Colo., in my district, the headquarters of one of these research centers, the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station is located. For the past 10 years this station has been studying some of the more important forest, range, and water problems. These studies are handled in cooperation with the Colorado State Agricultural Experiment Station. I have personally been on the ground and have seen some of the work being done; I have talked to the men conducting these investigations; and I have talked to many of the folks for whom the work is being done. The projects under way are, in my opinion, sound, they are being capably handled, and the results are being accepted and used by farmers, stockmen, and timberland owners.

Through its forest management studies this station is developing the most desirable methods of harvesting the timber from our mountain regions, and of reestablishing stands of timber on cut-over lands. While we all want these lands to make their full contribution in the war, the continued production of timber is essential to supply home needs after the war. Methods of harvesting spruce-fir forests is a particularly pressing problem at this time.

In a cooperative study on the Central Plains Experimental Range in Weld County, Colo., the Rocky Mountain Station has been studying range management practices which will give greater cattle production and aid in stabilizing the livestock industry on the plains. Practical stockmen, who are cooperating in this endeavor, make their cattle available for the studies.

One of the most important problems in which work has been done is that of determining the proper rate of stocking to produce the maximum amount of meat and yet assure maintained high production of range forage. Yearling Hereford cattle gained an average of 251 pounds per animal under heavy stocking, but comparable cattle gained 283 and 317 pounds, respectively, under moderate and light stocking. Considering costs of production, which, of course, every livestock operator must do, the greatest net income was realized from moderate stocking, rather than from either heavy or light. This emphasizes that if an effort is made to carry too many cattle they will not produce as much meat as a somewhat smaller number, and the

meat cannot be produced as economically.

Other valuable results of these range investigations could be cited. These results are being accepted and used by progressive stockmen throughout the plains and mountain country. Numerous prominent stockmen of both Colorado and Wyoming have expressed their keen interest in these investigations and the results which they are bringing forth for the livestock industry. Representatives of the agricultural experiment stations, who are familiar with the work, also have praised it highly. There is no question but what the direct benefits to the livestock industry and in turn to our war effort and consumers will be many times greater than the cost of the research to the Federal Government.

Directly related to these forest and range problems are many concerned with watershed management. Water is the lifeblood of the West. It provides for successful agriculture through irrigation and the power and municipal supplies essential to maintain our war-swollen cities. The Rocky Mountain Station is finding that we can increase the amount of water available for use by preventing certain losses. It has found, for example, that by the right kind of logging practices in the forests at high elevations, it can reduce evaporation losses and thereby increase streamflow approximately 30 percent. Such an increase, if from a widespread area, could mean still greater development of our water supplies.

Personally I consider this research program of the Forest Service one of the most important lines of work being carried on in the country. There are many problems yet to be solved, but if given the opportunity, I feel sure that the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station and its companion stations in other regions will find ways to solve them. I believe that the Forest Service deserves considerable praise for its conduct of these important investigations.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The lumber dealers in my State of Nebraska are very much disturbed over the fact that they cannot get enough lumber to supply the need of the farmers for lumber to build essential barns, sheds, and so forth. Can the gentleman tell us about the supply of lumber which we buy from the people out in his part of the country?

Mr. HILL. One of the troubles with the lumber situation has been the demands of the armed services in connection with crating and boxing the supplies we have to ship abroad. The type of lumber we produce in our particular territory is especially valuable for that kind of crates, with the result that the people of the gentleman's part of the country have been short of that kind of lumber. I think you will continue to be short for some time, until this great demand for shipping can be somewhat lessened.

Mr. STEFAN. While I was in Neraska a number of the retail lumber dealers had a small meeting and asked me to come in and see what relief we could get them with reference to lumber supplies, because the demands of the farmers for lumber are very large. We were told that the War Production Board had loosened the restrictions on lumber needed on the farm. I told them they would perhaps get some relief in the near future, but the gentleman indicates that that will not be the case.

Mr. HILL. I doubt it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that my State of Oregon is one of the great lumber-producing States of the country. The difficulty we are experiencing there is in getting trained workmen, men accustomed to the woods, to get the logs out and then to manufacture the logs into lumber. We could produce much more lumber than we are producing at the present time if manpower were available. What the gentleman has said is true, that a large portion of the lumber that is being produced is being used by the Government in war operations, particularly for boxing and crating the vast amount of material that is being sent overseas and all over the world.

Mr. HILL. And until that supply is properly filled there will not be an increase in farm lumber.

Mr. ANGELL. There will not be any increase in lumber until the manpower situation is taken care of?

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The lumber dealers have this to say and they put this question to us. There is going to be a tremendous amount of lumber which the Surplus Material Administrator is going to have on hand to let loose into private channels. There are a lot of these temporary houses being torn down and they are wondering whether or not that surplus lumber is going to be put back into regular channels and dealt out into industry through the regular lumber dealer channels so that they can put it where it is needed most.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman from Nebraska is well aware that the House right at this moment is working on a bill that will give us the proper type of organization to take care of the sale of these commodities that we are going to have in surplus. I think that bill should soon be brought to the floor of this House and enacted into law.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman. Does the gentleman agree if there is surplus lumber that these farmers can get through their dealers at this time that they should have it?

Mr. HILL. If not at this particular time then in a very short while.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I just want to make the observation that the War Production Board advised me last week the lumber production of this country today is the greatest ever in the history of the country. Yet it is more critical now than steel.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. NORRELL. They are expecting to begin to allocate steel to civilian projects to take the place of lumber.

Mr. HILL. I might say before I conclude, one of the things in this article which I am putting in the RECORD as part of my remarks, is the fact that we must begin now to build up our forests so that these supplies which you and I are talking about can be increased in a way to give us this production of lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GILLIE received permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention this afternoon to the situation that has existed in one of the departments of our Government for a long time. I respectfully call your attention to the wage situation as it appears in the Bureau of Animal Industry. For a long time now the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and particularly veterinarians, have labored under this situation as regards their salaries, and I want to talk to you about this salary problem. It appears to me, in view of the fact that we expect the finest talent we can get in all branches of our Government, and it is certainly true in the Bureau of Animal Industry, one sure way to get the highest type of veterinarians is to pay a better wage. Up to this time it is very evident that the wage scale is far too low in the Bureau of Animal Industry. I would like to see this House change the classification in this Department. I think everyone, all the taxpayers in the United States, especially the livestock interests and the pure-bred livestock interests, are all very much in favor of having the Bureau of Animal Industry one of the best departments in the Government. Up to this time the Bureau of Animal Industry is losing a great share of its good men and scientists. I know of several who have already left and I know of some more who are going unless their classification and the question of salary can be remedied. Up to this time 97 veterinarians have left the Service because of the fact that they cannot make a living on the salary they are receiving. I have several cases here showing that men who have come into the Service way back in 1917, 1920–23, and entered at a salary of $2,000, are now receiving $2,400. That is a good many years to serve in order to get a $400 raise.

I would like to see the Bureau in such a position that they can demand the highest type of veterinarians that our country can produce. Why should not we have the best veterinarians that the country can produce in the Bureau of Animal Industry? That is where they belong and that is where they ought to be. Down through the years since the Bureau was organized back in 1884, the B. A. I. had to combat a good many very

serious and dangerous diseases, diseases such as foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, anthrax, hog cholera, glanders, dourine, and scabies, and many others. These are dangerous diseases to the livestock. Thousands of herds would be lost to the country had it not been for the efficient Bureau of Animal Industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman appreciates the effect upon the health and welfare of this country of the work which the gentleman has outlined as being done by these men engaged in this occupation and profession as being of tremendous worth to the public generally?

Mr. GILLIE. That is right. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I know the gentleman from Indiana is an authority on this subject. I have some knowledge of it, being very closely associated with veterinarians in the State of Nebraska who have done so much work in hog cholera and other diseases among animals. In the gentleman's opinion is there some danger to the health of the United States as a result of the lack of proper meat inspection and the work of veterinarians, if some relief is not given to these people?

Mr. GILLIE. I will say to the gentleman that during the last war they had an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease which cost the Government millions of dollars to suppress. That was during the last war and we might have another scourge again in this war, by sabotage, perhaps, or some other way, in which this disease might be brought into this country. Rinderpest is one of the worst diseases that Japan has to deal with. They have always had it. They have it there in a virulent form and if it ever gets into this country we would lose many of our fine herds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very sympathetic to the appeal of the gentleman to the Congress to reclassify these employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, but as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am somewhat worried about the reclassification of employees in one department setting a precedent in that particular department, because in my opinion it would be followed by requests for reclassification in other departments, in spite of my deep sympathy and my concern for the health of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, our independent cheese factories are slowly but surely being liquidated, and the Office of Price Administration is contributing to this liquidation.

In analyzing certain provisions of the cheese order—order 2891—it is necessary to take into consideration the claim that since the Federal Government is confronted with the task of large-scale buying, it must use those existing facilities which lend themselves to this type of purchasing operations.

Large-scale buying presupposes a concentration of distribution facilities combined with the possibility of an easy and ready handling of a product. This explains two things in the Government's cheese-buying activities:

(a) That it uses the large dairy corporations for the simple reason that the independent assembler has practically disappeared and that the distribution of over 70 percent of the cheese of the Nation is concentrated in the hands of four large concerns, while the marketing of the rest of the cheese is to a large extent indirectly influenced by the large corporations; and

(b) It explains the fact that the distribution of process cheese is looked upon with more favor than that of natural cheese because of the high degree of standardization and possibility of preservation which has been developed with respect to process cheese.

The recently issued order on cheese seems to substantiate this view. It contains, among other things, two sections, one concerning price differentials between large and small styles of cheese and the other relating to maximum prices in connection with moisture content.

The section relating to the styles of cheese provides for the establishment of a maximum price for Cheddar cheese delivered at all places in the State of Wisconsin regardless of point of origin. This maximum price is set forth in the table below—table A, page 5 of the order:

TABLE A

Maximum price (cents per pound)	Styles	Approximate weight (pounds)
23¼	Cheddars, twins and larger	(1)
23½	Flats	35
23¾	Double daisies	44
23¾	Triple daisies	66
24¼	Single daisies	22
24¼	Longhorns	12
24¼	Young Americas	12
24½	Picnics and midgets	12
24½	Square prints	10
24½	Natural loaf and smaller styles	(2)

[1] 70 or more. [2] 5 or less.

A glance at the above table reveals one outstanding feature, namely the low differential between the price established for the larger styles and that established for the smaller styles. This low differential places the smaller styles of cheese at a disadvantage and will result in eliminating these styles from the market in favor of the larger styles.

The reason for criticizing these low differentials is that the smaller styles of cheese involve a higher proportional cost than the larger styles due principally to the following reasons.

First. The shrinkage on the smaller styles is greater.

Second. More labor is involved in the manufacture of smaller styles.

Third. The cost of bandages on the smaller styles is higher.

Fourth. The cost of boxes is higher.

Fifth. More money is invested in hoops and presses and more room and plant facilities are necessary.

The disadvantageous position in which the factories making small styles of cheese are placed presents to them one way out—to change from the making of the smaller to the larger styles. This, however, will be very difficult not only because of the cost involved, but particularly because of the difficulty of obtaining hoops.

The important thing with regard to the smaller styles of cheese is that it will be of considerable disadvantage to the retailer in the marketing of natural cheese. It is obvious that retailing presupposes sales in small quantities. If obstacles are placed in the way of the retailer in handling small styles, the convenient process cheese packages will completely eliminate the natural cheese from the retailers' counters.

Another factor which will work powerfully toward the elimination of natural in favor of process cheese is the determination of prices for twins and cheddars when sold for processing or to Government agencies in relation to moisture as set forth in the table below taken from the O. P. A. order—table B, page 5 of the order:

TABLE B

Moisture content	Maximum price, cents per pound	
	For Cheddars, twins, and larger styles	For flats
33.2 percent	25.54	25.79
Over 33.2 percent but not over 33.7 percent	25.35	25.60
Over 33.7 percent but not over 34.2 percent	25.16	25.41
Over 34.2 percent but not over 34.7 percent	24.97	25.22
Over 34.7 percent but not over 35.2 percent	24.77	25.02
Over 35.2 percent but not over 35.7 percent	24.58	24.83
Over 35.7 percent but not over 36.2 percent	24.39	24.64
Over 36.2 percent but not over 36.7 percent	24.20	24.45
Over 36.7 percent but not over 37.2 percent	24.01	24.26
Over 37.2 percent but not over 37.7 percent	23.82	24.07

The definite consequence of this order will be that no cheese under 37½ percent moisture content will be put into storage. But under present conditions it is practically impossible to keep in storage even for a period of 6 months, cheese with a moisture content of more than 37½ percent moisture because of quicker deterioration.

It should be noted that cheese is exempted from the maximum price regulation as cured cheese only if it is 6 months old or more. But on the other hand, this precludes anyone from buying and keeping cheese for storage and sale as cured cheese. Therefore, it is evident

that the effect of this order will be the practical elimination of cured cheese and a tremendous increase in the volume of processed cheese. This is the more tragic, since we have been spending so much effort toward building up the sale of cured cheese as one of Wisconsin's finest products.

It was stated above that it is claimed that the Federal Government is confronted with the task of large-scale distribution which logically favors the services of large dairy concerns. The use of a product such as process cheese is claimed to be particularly adapted to such distribution. It should be pointed out that in the long run this will have the consequence of a tremendous increase in the production of process cheese and the practical elimination of natural cheese. The development of a package for natural cheese has been neglected for many years by private concerns in favor of packaged process cheese, because of the higher profits involved in the production and distribution of the latter type of cheese. However, during the past few years due principally to the efforts of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and the Dairy Improvement Association, so much progress has been made in the development of a package for natural cheese that this type of cheese became a serious threat to the process cheese industry. The O. P. A. order, however, threatens to nullify the progress made by natural cheese consumption.

This is connected with another development which constitutes a threat to the soundness of the cheese industry, namely the disregard of the problem of quality. This was brought out very clearly by a statement of an O. P. A. official at a recent conference in the offices of the department to the effect that in view of a tight market little attention is being paid to quality.

The interesting thing is that we are now repeating the experience of the First World War. Up to the beginning of that war, the quality of the cheese produced in the Nation, particularly in the States of Wisconsin and New York, was very high. During the war it had deteriorated to such an extent that strenuous efforts have been made by this State and by the Federal Government to improve the quality during the years immediately preceding the present war. If we allow a repetition during this war of what happened during the last war, all our past efforts in trying to improve quality will be nullified with the additional result that a more favorable situation will be developed for the process cheese to dominate completely the cheese industry.

It is our belief that despite the problem of large-scale distribution during war which confronts the Government, it is possible to arrange conditions under which the work of quality development will go on unhindered. In order to arrive at this solution it is imperative that those Federal agencies which are concerned with the buying of cheese be willing to meet with the official representatives of the cheese producing States to devise a plan for the continuation of conditions which favor the production of a quality product.

The above facts and material were obtained for me by Mr. William Kirsch, chief statistician of the department of agriculture of my State of Wisconsin. Mr. Kirsch is a very capable State official who is painstakingly devoted to the agricultural interests of Wisconsin and has devoted years of study and research to our problems, particularly the problems of dairy products. His work can be accepted without question.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, before I start on the soil conservation question I would like to supplement what my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] has said about the harassing that our cheese industry is getting in the great State of Wisconsin. They have a price fixed of 27 cents to the farmer on good American cheese that has 30-percent fats and 39-percent moisture, yet right here in Washington today they are allowing cottage cheese, which has 72 percent moisture and 4 or 5 percent fat, to be sold for 29 cents. The O. P. A. ceiling on American cheese is supposed to be 36 cents. That just does not make sense, and it is going to wreck the industry, not only the American cheese but also the Italian cheese and the Swiss cheese and all the cheese industry. It is all unnecessary. It is all happening just because there does not seem to be enough people to have enough interest to take enough time to find out what the problems are in connection with that.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Let me point out that among the fine grades of cheese made in my district, and perhaps some in your district, is the famous Wisconsin blue, which is the same as Roquefort. Their price at the factory is limited to 39 cents. My wife bought some in a store the other day. She could not get our type and was told to take another type by the grocer. It was Argentine blue and sold at $1.25 a pound.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

OUR LEGISLATIVE APPROACH TO SOIL FERTILITY AND SOIL CONSERVATION

There are five routes through which Federal funds have been and are being appropriated for the improvements and conservation of our soil.

First. Three appropriations to the land-grant colleges and experiment stations. This appropriation has been in existence for over 50 years and valuable soil information has resulted from these studies and experiments during this time.

Second. For over 25 years the Extension Service has devoted considerable time and effort in its attempt to carry the messages discovered by the experiment stations to the farms of the various States.

Third. We have had the soil conservation and fertility program of the Farm Security Administration which has been largely conducted through the lower income farm groups.

Fourth. We have the soil programs of the A. A. A. This is the only agency up to this time wherein large appropriations were provided for their soil work. Their work has included not only the soil fertility problems in the distribution of lime and mineral fertilizers but also the problem of improving the physical condition of the soil. The A. A. A. has distributed a total of 63,000,000 tons of lime, 85,000 tons of muriate of potash, and over 4,000,000 tons of phosphate up to January 1, 1943. The A. A. A. program has gradually increased its soil work and in 1942 a total of $167,000,000 was spent for soil fertility alone. In addition to the soil-fertility program the A. A. A. in 1942 carried on a program of strip cropping, tree planting, grass and legume seeding, cover crop plans, contour listing pasture or range land, and other soil-conserving practices.

Fifth. We have the Soil Conservation Service. This service is largely one of personnel wherein the agency cooperates with the agricultural colleges and States in the establishment of soil districts in many States. The State of Wisconsin has cooperated with this service. The projects include strip farming, prevention of soil erosion, and other soil-conservation practices.

It appears that some three million of the requested appropriation for 1944 was to be allocated to drainage projects, but that this money was not provided for in the 1944 agricultural bill now under consideration.

The following official information from the Soil Conservation Service shows the personnel in the United States, in Wisconsin, and in the Seventh Wisconsin District, which I have the honor to represent:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Number of employees in the entire Service as of Jan. 1, 1944

Departmental (Washington, D. C.):	
Regular	291
Temporary	1
W. A. E. (while actually employed)	[1] 2
Total departmental	295
Field (other than Washington, D. C.):	
Regular	6,443
Temporary	125
W. A. E. (while actually employed)	[1] 2,489
Without compensation	[2] 85
Total field	9,142

[1] Temporary or seasonal aids employed to assist farmers in speeding up the application of the conservation plans prepared by the technicians.

[2] Primarily college or experiment-station officials listed as collaborators, but not on our pay roll.

The above figures do not include employees on military furlough.

Outside continental United States:	
Puerto Rico	43
Virgin Islands	3
Total outside continental United States	46
Total (entire Service—permanent and temporary)	9,483
Temporary	2,597
Total permanent employees	6,906
Number of employees in State of Wisconsin:	
State office	10
Research (cooperating with State experiment stations)	18
Nursery	1
Number of employees in State of Wisconsin—Continued.	
Field offices	129
Total employees, State of Wisconsin	158

Number of employees in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin

County and location:	*Number*
Adams, Friendship	2
Marathon, Stratford	2
Marathon, Wausau	6
Waushara, Wautoma	5
Wood, Wisconsin Rapids	2
Total (Seventh Congressional district)	17

The following table shows the allocation of funds as a whole for the United States:

Funds expended by the Soil Conservation Service by program during the fiscal year 1943

	Personal services	Materials, equipment, etc.	Total
Regular funds, the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act:			
Soil Conservation Service regular program (Public 46, 74th Cong.)	$19,687,021	$3,130,724	$22,817,745
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land	1,151,864	680,575	1,832,439
Cooperative farm forestry	175,536	22,417	197,953
Development of water facilities		31,309	31,309
Miscellaneous allotments and working funds:			
Emergency Relief	711		711
Public Works Administration	53,848	42,968	96,816
Funds advanced from the War Department for making and reproducing maps	440,765	131,356	572,121
Funds, transfer from the War Department for the flood-control program	76,073	19,926	95,999
Funds advanced from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs for expenses of Latin-American trainees		51,261	51,261
Funds advanced from the Public Roads Administration for water run-offs and infiltration studies on roadside strips		3,413	3,413
Funds advanced from the State Department for salary of technician assigned to China	5,205		5,205
Special and technical investigations, international joint commission, United States and Great Britain, funds advanced from the State Department	1,261	276	1,537
Expenses in connection with the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps assigned to the Soil Conservation Service	441,185	24,984	466,169
Selective Service System funds allotted to the Soil Conservation Service in connection with camps for conscientious objectors assigned to work of the Soil Conservation Service	125,172	58,389	183,561
Total	22,158,641	4,197,598	26,356,239

There are two conclusions in connection with this soil problem that appear to be of merit. The first one is that many people familiar with the soil problems for 50 years feel that there should be a coordination of programs; and, second, that if this coordination was put into operation a large saving in expenditure of public funds could be attained. This economy angle will evidently become of more importance.

Since Prof. C. J. Chapman and Soils and Men estimate that we are losing twice as much phosphate as is being applied, and losing nine times as much potash as is being applied, it is apparent that considerable educational work must still be done. In addition, the physical soil problem, including humus improvement and erosion control, demands our constant attention and consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, as far as this side is concerned we have no other speakers.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

[Mr. OUTLAND addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there are no further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Administrator, and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

[Mr. MILLER of Connecticut addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle, $5,240,355, together with not to exceed $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided*, That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed, condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 22, line 10, strike out "$5,240,355" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,433,232."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I understand the gentleman has several amendments connected with the same subject matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. I wonder if he would not be willing to submit them all at this time and have them voted on en bloc.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to ask that they might all be considered together inasmuch as they relate to the same subject matter and in the aggregate provide an increase of $996,000 in different items under animal husbandry, the money to be used for the reclassification of veterinarians so that more veterinarians can be induced to enter the service.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my other amendments to this item may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his amendments to this item may be considered en bloc. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 22, strike out "$114,288" and insert in lieu thereof "$115,440."

Page 24, line 8, strike out "$951,253" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,003,160."

Page 24, line 13, strike out "$8,616,759" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,359,124."

Page 24, line 20, strike out "$272,115" and insert in lieu thereof "$279,228."

Page 25, line 22, strike out "$37,007" and insert "$38,444."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairm[illegible] ask unanimous consent to proceed [illegible] additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for use of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this matter is not very involved. When the committee print came to the subcommittee, the Bureau of the Budget by including $996,000 for this purpose virtually recommended that that money be appropriated to take care of the reclassification of veterinarians who are a large professional group in the Department of Agriculture and the most underpaid professional group probably in the entire Government. I submitted these amendments to the full committee, but I must confess that my feeble powers of persuasion were not equal to the task and the full committee therefore rejected the proposal. It does, however, in my opinion, merit consideration. There is involved here something more than reclassification for pay increases.

Mr. Chairman, this money would be used to increase the pay of virtually 2,472 veterinarians and lay inspectors whose business it is to carry on meat inspection, and the inspection of tubercular cattle, inspection for Bang's disease, check up on serums, hog cholera, and similar functions. It involves, therefore, the health of the livestock population of the country and particularly at a time when we are standing on the threshold of probably the greatest slaughter of beef animals in the history of our country. The Department needs these inspectors and it needs more than it has at the present time.

I am informed that from February to December 1943 more than 288 veterinarians, inspectors, and lay assistants have left the service and the reason they left the service was that the remuneration for the amount of education that you have to have in order to carry on this kind of work is wholly inadequate and is disproportionate to the wages and salaries that are being paid to people in other lines of endeavor. There are 591 of these folks who have a P–1 rating today under our Classification Act. Three hundred and fifty-six of them have served for 5 years or more and 65 have served for 10 years or more. There, I think, you have some testimony as to the fidelity of their service at a time when they could make infinitely more money outside the Government.

There are 294 of them with a P–2 classification, 237 having served for more than 10 years, 165 for more than 20 years, and 26 for more than 30 years.

The difficulty is that the salaries that they receive are disproportionately so small that there is no incentive for people to come into this line of endeavor today. The State veterinarian of the State of Illinois called me the other day. I think we have 81 in the State service and about 17 Federal inspectors out there. He said, "This thing is absolutely imperative because there is no inducement for young men who come out of a veterinarian course that takes 5 years to go into the Government service when he can do infinitely better elsewhere."

The Department is asking for it; the Bureau of the Budget said it was all right and recommended the funds; the livestock people of the country have been here in Washington representing the cause not only to Members of the Congress but to the Department officials as well; so they are insisting that this be done to, in part at least, alleviate a condition under which they cannot get enough inspectors and veterinarians to come into the service. In view of the slaughter that will take place very soon, the necessity for careful inspection of our livestock, the fact that there is involved here the health of the civilian population and the soldiers, I think dictates the adoption of this amendment.

It will be argued, no doubt, that this will set a precedent for other classifications in the Government, but I do not believe so. There is something more involved here than the question of a precedent and the question of whether or not other groups in the governmental service will come here to ask for $200 or $300 or $400 a year.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The particular service rendered by the members of this profession is preceded by a long course of study.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just the same as for a man to qualify himself to practice medicine or to practice dentistry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. They must know animal husbandry and be able to stop the spread of contagious disease which otherwise would destroy millions of our livestock.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Bureau of Animal Husbandry contacted the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has given an examination for the grade of junior veterinarian. There were 53 on the register. They contacted 47 of the 53 and they did not get a single one to come into the service because the answer was, "Why go into the Federal service for meat inspection and quarantine? We can do infinitely better elsewhere."

Mr. Chairman, this is not only a question of keeping what we have but of getting additional inspectors that are so sorely needed for livestock and quarantine inspection today. They have even persuaded the Civil Service Commission to change the age limit and to change some of the qualifications in order to make it easier, but notwithstanding the very frantic, desperate efforts that have been made, the Bureau of Animal Husbandry is still in difficulty. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that evidently they sold the Bureau of the Budget on the idea, because the Bureau of the Budget proposes that the money be provided in this bill. The livestock people are interested through their associations and otherwise. I think this has merit from the standpoint of health, from the standpoint of sanitation, from the standpoint of adequate inspection of that vast amount of beef and hogs that are going to be slaughtered within the next 60 or 90 days.

Mr. Chairman, one other thing. There are 3,300 plants in the country today that are nonfederally inspected. Of that number about 300 have applied for and will have Federal inspection. That simply enlarges the job. If you are going to mandate these people to come in for inspection, you have got to have the inspectors. The question is, Where are you going to get them? The money represented in these amendments is a step in that direction and has the approval of the Budget Bureau and of all the livestock people.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to compliment the gentleman for making his fight for this worthy cause. Is it not a fact also that even in peacetimes, because of salary differential, there has been a shortage of veterinarians throughout the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may observe that we had the same condition in 1928 and Congress then provided $200,000 in order that they might get an additional $200 a year. So there is some precedent for this kind of action.

Mr. GRANGER. In view of the further fact of the tremendous necessity we have for this at the present time, as the gentleman has indicated, even if it set a precedent it would be justified from the standpoint of health alone?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. That is the important question.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on so ably presenting the case for the veterinarians, and also the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] who brought out the fact that they are a skilled technical group. I have received many communications from individuals and organizations in my State and from the State livestock and State wool associations that if we do not give these people this added money, we are going to pay for it in the way of a tremendous loss so far as our food program is concerned. We cannot afford to do that at this or at any other time. I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment not only because it is necessary but because it will give justice to an extremely worthy group.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. So, there is involved here the health of the people and those in the armed services.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman state what the present salary range is and how much he intends to increase it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. One grade, for instance, will start in at $2,000. Some grades, I think, start in at $1,620. As I recall, this would give them about $400. I believe the House is sufficiently familiar with my own efforts to bring about economy in Government to appreciate that I would not sponsor a proposal to spend this sum of public funds unless there was ample, sound, and convincing reasons for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that out in Fort Collins, Colo., we have one of the finest veterinary departments of any school in the entire world, and our boys have found employment in practically every nation under the sun. They are doing a wonderfully fine piece of work. That is important.

When a boy out of college, with 5 years' work, can go into practice and earn twice as much as these experts in the Department—if you do not raise these salaries—there is not much inclination on the part of these fine experts down here in the Department to stay on with the Federal Government. That is an important point in this discussion. If we are to keep these experts in the Department of Agriculture, not only in veterinarian work but in other lines of activity, we have got to provide a pay schedule that will keep these men interested in their work and in the advancement and improvement of their line of endeavor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am in sympathy with the amendment, but there is a problem that arises in connection with it about which I am disturbed, and perhaps the gentleman can throw some light on it. Our Nebraska delegation discussed it this morning at their weekly meeting. It is this: There are practically no veterinarians left in the country to take care of the farmers' needs. In the case of one veterinarian it was brought out that he is covering five counties, vaccinating hogs and cattle and caring for the sick livestock and everything else. Will the adoption of this amendment make it more acute for the farmers or the stock raisers? I hesitate to raise the question because I am in sympathy with the amendment.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I cannot see how this would affect the ordinary practice of veterinary students who are just coming into the field.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it take those veterinarians away from the farmer if they go to the Government?

Mr. HILL. This would affect only those now in the service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment does not give a raise to those who come in at this time?

Mr. HILL. I am not positive of that.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. One reason we are short of veterinarians, as is indicated by the Nebraska experience, is due to the fact that this differential working against your veterinarians has existed for a long while. They, historically, have received subpar pay, particularly in the fields of State and Federal employment. It has not been an attractive profession to get into. I know at one time the secretary of our State department of highways was getting more than the man who headed our State veterinary department. That has existed for a long while. The case is cited of a man who went to work for the Government in 1919 in veterinary work at $2,000, who today, after 24 years, is getting only $2,400. Probably the Department itself has not rewarded their own men properly.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that the idea of this increase is to assist in keeping the men who are already in the Federal service.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As far as the veterinarians employed out of the Federal Government service are concerned, they are making a pretty fair living, because they are not regulated by the wage scale in the service. If we do not do something to help these people in the service, they are going out in private practice, and where will we be?

Mr. HILL. The very question that our friend from Nebraska asked shows that when veterinarians are serving as high as five counties, it simply means that their income is three to five times more than men with years of experience in the Department of Agriculture are receiving at this time for their work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There has been the customary number of graduates from veterinary schools and the deans of those schools have been contacted, but there is no incentive for them to get into Government service. This would be helpful all the way around.

Mr. HILL. I might add when a man enters this service he enters a technical service that requires years of training to become expert in this line of endeavor.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I think our friends need not be apprehensive that it will take veterinarians out of private practice for the reason people now know what good they are doing, and they are making good money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am very heartily in favor of the amendments which have been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I am sorry that perhaps some of the Members were not here when the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] spoke upon the importance of this work which is done by the various meat-inspection and food-inspection departments. I think it has been an unhappy situation that we have faced in the picture today, the need of reclassification of the salaried lay-inspectors, and it is indeed intriguing to find a group of Republicans in here fighting to increase governmental salaries, which but emphasizes the need of these amendments.

I have had a great many wires, telegrams, and letters from people in my State. We have very large stockyards and packing industries at South St. Paul.

These men in this work, some of them having been lay inspectors for as long as 16 years, wire me that they are getting less than common laborers in the work which they are doing of that type.

I would like to say further that I have a communication from Dr. Boyd, the distinguished head of the University of Minnesota, division of veterinary medicine, calling to my attention the importance of this work in a public-health way.

These inspectors are either veterinarians or they are lay inspectors with many, many years of experience. They do not get this experience in a few days or a few months, but it takes a course of years, and through professional training. I think the great importance here is that we have to keep these inspectors. It is a matter of public health. Here we are preparing this tremendous amount of livestock which goes not only to the public but to our armed forces, and it must have the type of inspection of that product which is so necessary for our welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It might be well to point out, too, that while the livestock population of the country is increasing, the veterinarians who are looking after all this livestock are in effect decreasing in number, proportionately, and they cannot give enough attention to the needs of the people.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the course of the next 6 months we will probably have the greatest amount of meat preparation that has ever taken place in the history of this country. If ever we have need of that skilled inspection we need it today, not a year from now, but we need it today, and I certainly hope that the several amendments of the gentleman from Illinois will be treated favorably by the Congress in passing upon this.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. I would like to say that many are going to say that this is not an economy measure, but I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is correct that if we are going to have a Bureau of Animal Husbandry at the

highest point of efficiency, we are going to have to get the kind of men we need to handle it.

Mr. O'HARA. I will say to the gentleman that I do not believe in talking about economy when we are dealing with the health and safety of our armed forces or the public generally in this country. I do not think there is any wisdom in preaching economy and playing with possible serious disastrous results.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to say to the gentleman I am heartily in accord with what he says. In my State, as the gentleman knows, we have a large amount of stock and it is absolutely necessary that we have trained, skilled men in a veterinary capacity, not only to inspect the stock but to be present when it is killed in order to protect the lives of our citizens.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman. I have been talking about the inspection of food, but it includes the raising and production of the stock itself, and that also is of the greatest importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is an item that raises the pay of one particular group of Federal employees?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. If we attempt in one bill to raise the pay of one group of employees does it not naturally follow that we have to go all the way down the line and raise the pay of everybody else?

Mr. TARVER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I think I am justified in saying that the effect of the adoption of these amendments would be to bring about demands for increases in compensation for Federal employees quite generally in all branches of the Federal Government. There will also be repercussions in private industry, where employees who have so far abided by the restrictions of the Little Steel formula would, if we set an example here of raising Federal employees beyond the limitations provided in the formula, immediately begin demands to be accorded the same kind of treatment in their employment in private industry. I think this is one of the most dangerous amendments proposed to any appropriation bill within recent months.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that these people have already received the same increase that other Federal employees have received under Public Law 49?

Mr. TARVER. Twenty-one and sixtenths percent, under the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, amounting in the average to $452 per individual employee of these 2,472 employees who are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I am always regretful when I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for whose ability, for whose intellectual honesty, and for whose sincerity of purpose I have the highest regard; but I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois will be very deeply disappointed if the amendments offered by him are not adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The subject matter is one which had the attention of the deficiency subcommittee and also the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. The whole Committee on Appropriations also considered the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and rejected them by a vote of 19 to 4. The opportunity for intelligent consideration of this subject matter on the part of these two subcommittees and on the part of the full Committee on Appropriations was much better than the opportunity is today for the Members of the Committee of the Whole to consider them. I sincerely hope that the Committee of the Whole will not reverse the judgment of the two subcommittees in question and of the full Committee on Appropriations.

I think all of us approach the consideration of this problem in the most sympathetic frame of mind as far as the reclassification of these field employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry is concerned. This is a problem which has been pending for more than 10 years and it is only at a time of acute national emergency that it is brought before the House of Representatives for consideration. The only effect of the approval of this reclassification plan is to bring about an increase above the average increase of $452 a year accorded by the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, for each of these 2,472 employees, of $289.

We had the legislative appropriation bill before the House the other day. When it came into the full Committee on Appropriations it contained a provision appropriating $330,000 to increase the salaries of the law clerks of the Federal district and circuit judges. The full Committee on Appropriations struck out that provision for substantially the same reasons that are being urged here today against the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois, that is, that we did not feel that at this time, regardless of the merits of the case, we could afford to enter upon the policy of increasing the annual compensation of any particular type of employees of the Federal Government, realizing that if we do that there will be numerous other organizations of employees of the Federal Government who will come before the Congress and insist upon the same type of consideration.

I was talking a few moments ago with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who is chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, and he has given me permission to quote what he said to me, that is, that there are many types of positions in the Federal Government at this time for which available personnel cannot be secured but for which that personnel could be secured if increases in compensation should be granted. So let no one linger under the delusion that if we provide for this increase in compensation for the field employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry we have ended the question, because it would be only the beginning. We will have started a spiral the end of which it would be impossible to foresee.

As I said awhile ago in response to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] there will also be repercussions in private industry. You will be going before the employees of private industry in this country, who are being held down by what is known as the Little Steel formula, and saying: "You must continue to observe the limitations of that formula, and not ask wage increases in excess of it, yet at the same time we have in the Federal Government granted an increase not only of 21.6 percent to all Federal employees but in addition we have within 1 year raised the salaries of other employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, 2,472 of them, by an additional average of $289 per employee."

So I think this is something you ought to consider very carefully and which I hope you will not do.

The amount involved is more than $996,000—$996,000 is the amount of these amendments. But we have provided in the bill the reappropriation of $343,000 from funds heretofore appropriated for the eradication of tuberculosis and Bang's disease, which will not be used during this fiscal year unless this reclassification plan is put into effect. If it is put into effect, and it will be if you approve these amendments, that money will be used during the present fiscal year, it will not be available for reappropriation, and we must add to the amounts in the bill not only the $996,000 plus but $343,000 in addition which will be necessary for that purpose, making a total of approximately $1,340,000. You may not be very much concerned with $1,340,000, but it is a considerable sum.

I am not very much in sympathy with the arguments which have been advanced about these employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry quitting the service if their salaries are not increased. They had what is regarded as good jobs during the lean years when there were millions of men in this country who did not have any employment. When war conditions come about their services are absolutely essential to the Government's program since they are engaged in this work of meat inspection; yet men come and say in their behalf—they have not said it, but men have said it in their behalf—that if they do not get this raise in salaries they are going to quit this important service of the Government and go into a service where they are able to earn more money. Farm employees in my part of the country cannot leave the farm and go to work in war industries where they can make from three to four times what they used to make, unless they get a certificate of availability from the United States Employment Service.

But now we are told that these men who get as high as $3,200 a year will quit the service of the Government and go into something where they can get better compensation unless we raise their salaries. Now, I do not believe that those who advance those arguments cor-

rectly represent the viewpoints of those men. I think those employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry are just as patriotic as anybody else, and I do not believe that when our boys who are fighting and dying on the battlefields all over the world and on the seven seas for $50 a month in the great majority of cases, these men who are engaged in this important work behind the lines are going to say, "We are going to strike on the job and we are going to seek other employment unless you give us an increase beyond what we are now receiving, notwithstanding we have had a 21.6 percent increase within the last 12 months."

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman spoke about this 21.6 percent increase of all the Government employees. What about this, here in P-3, P-4, and P-5, for instance, the attorneys in the Office of Price Administration who are in grade P-4 and P-5 are raised in a range of $3,200 to $4,600 in less than a period of 3 years?

Mr. TARVER. We are not dealing with the Office of Price Administration and I cannot answer the gentleman's question in regard to the salaries of that Office.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GILLIE was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, in 1923 Congress held out to all of its professional and subprofessional civilian employees the prospect that all of them would receive equal pay for equal work and outlined the principles to be followed first by the Director of the Budget and later by the Civil Service Commission in the classification of positions by grades with pay for the different grades varying in accord with the skill required and the responsibilities attached to each position. Reclassification requires investigation and progress has been slow, particularly with the reclassification of positions in the older organizations, but in 1943 investigations of the field services of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Division, now a part of the Office of Distribution, War Food Administration, were completed and a reclassification of the positions filled by the veterinarians and the lay assistants in these services was established by the Civil Service Commission. This reclassification, set up by the agency, directed by Congress to make it, provides for increased pay of 977 veterinarians and 2,165 lay assistants.

To put this classification into effect, increased appropriations amounting in all to about $750,000, including $152,301 war overtime pay, are included in the estimate submitted by the War Food Administration for the fiscal year 1945.

The request for these increased appropriations comes to Congress with the approval of the War Food Administration and the Director of the Budget after a full and complete investigation and study, and the question is now squarely presented to Congress whether to approve this request or, by disapproving it, to deny to the veterinarians and their lay assistants the benefits of the assurance offered to them by Congress in the Federal Classification Act that the positions held by them would be reclassified so as to provide equal pay for equal work.

The survey conducted preliminary to the proposed reclassification shows unmistakably that the veterinarians in the field services are now and for several years have been grossly underpaid. The total number of these professional employees at the beginning of the year was 1,579. Of this total 299 have been in grade No. 1—$2,000 to $2,600—from 5 to 10 years; 82 have been in the same grade from 3 to 5 years, and 150 have been in that grade up to 3 years. In grade No. 2—$2,600 to $3,200—74 doctors have been employed from 20 to 30 years and 65 have been employed from 15 to 20 years. Of the total number of veterinarians now employed, 6.5 percent are in grade No. 3—$3,200 to $3,800; 1.5 percent are in grade No. 4—$3,800 to $4,600; and 2 percent are in grades Nos. 5 to 8—$4,600 to $9,000. The salary steps within the present grades are limited to $100 each, and the full year changes in basic salaries of the doctors as reclassified amount to $367,000. Out of a total of 2,472 lay assistants, 95 have been in grade No. 4—$1,620—from 5 to 10 years and 950 have been in that grade up to 3 years; 46 have been in grade No. 5—$1,800—from 5 to 10 years with 96 in the same grade up to 3 years; 148 have been in grade No. 6—$2,000—from 10 to 15 years, with 111 in that grade up to 3 years, and 266 in this same grade from 15 to 20 years; 46 have been in grade No. 8—$2,600—up to 3 years. The full year changes in basic salaries for lay assistants as reclassified amounts to $477,520.

On comparing veterinarians with other professional groups in the Department, it appears that veterinarians in the field services are poorly paid.

The percentages of professional groups in the Department by grades are:

Grade	Doctors of veterinary medicine	All other professional groups
P-1	61.5	21.2
P-2	28.5	35.0
P-3	6.5	22.0
P-4	1.5	10.0
P-5 to P-8	2.0	11.8

Notwithstanding the slow rate of promotion and the preponderance of these professional employees in the lower grades, a high rate of efficiency has been maintained both by the B. A. I. and the Meat Inspection Service. Veterinarians are a highly skilled group and they are devoting their skill wholeheartedly to the fulfillment of the war-food program. Their contribution is of first importance to the meat supply. Now that the reclassification has been worked out by the Civil Service Commission, I urge, as a matter of fairness and good faith, that Congress should now appropriate the requested funds to provide compensation for the field services of the B. A. I. and the Meat Inspection Service and thus give effect to the policy declared by Congress in the Classification Act. Otherwise, as to them, the reclassification by the agency authorized to prepare it becomes merely an idle gesture and the Classification Act becomes a nullity.

The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is an important one, and I trust that it will pass and return the Bureau of Animal Industry to the high position it has held down through the years.

In my request to extend my remarks I include therein some "pertinent facts" signed by several livestock associations:

RECLASSIFICATION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY AND OF THE MEAT INSPECTION SERVICE OF THE OFFICE OF DISTRIBUTION OF WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, BUDGET FOR 1944-45

PERTINENT FACTS

1. The persons affected by these recommendations have been underpaid for many years. At present they are the lowest-paid large professional group in the Department of Agriculture. The requests will not give them a preferred position in the Department. It will only place them on an equal status with others in the Department. Without the reclassification, there is great danger that the meat-inspection service and disease control will break down. The deterioration of the animal disease-control service cannot be looked upon with complacency by the livestock interests of the country, neither is it believed to be good policy to allow the fine meat-inspection service which has been built up in this country to disintegrate. Both require well-trained, intelligent personnel which cannot be maintained without establishing more satisfactory salaries than now obtain.

2. According to the testimony offered by the Department in the hearing before the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations last fall (1943), 61.5 percent of the professional employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry were in the P-1 classification, the beginner's grade, whereas no other large group of professional employees of the Department of Agriculture contained more than 21.2 percent.

3. Under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, it is provided that employees be advanced to higher grades after they have acquired experience. For many years, because of lack of funds, these promotions have not been made in this group. At present, of the 591 veterinarians in the P-1 grade, 356 have served more than 5 years and 65 more than 10 years. Of the 294 veterinarians in the P-2 classification, 237 have served more than 10 years, 165 more than 20 years, and 26 more than 30 years.

4. These veterinarians and their lay assistants receive benefits of the overtime pay bill of last year, the same as all other civil-service employees, but their relative position is no better than before. In fact, the relative position is poorer because overtime pay is calculated on the base pay, and therefore the increments received by these employees are smaller.

5. The poor salary situation of this group is well known to veterinary students and schools and for years the Department has not been able to recruit sufficient good personnel. Also the turn-over has been large and in recent years separations have far exceeded the number that could be recruited. Both disease-control groups and the meat-inspection service are at present far understaffed.

On behalf of our respective organizations, we, the undersigned, respectfully urge favorable consideration of this requested reclassification of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry to the end that the livestock and meat industries may continue to be assured of adequate disease control and in-

spection facilities, and the public of a plentiful supply of clean, wholesome, and disease-free meat.

American National Livestock Association, Denver, A. D. Brownfield, president, F. E. Mollin, executive secretary and treasurer; American Pork Producers Association, Peoria, Ill., Ted Anderson, president, Eugene Harsh, secretary; National Livestock Producers Association, Chicago, Ill., B. B. Brumley, president, P. O. Wilson, secretary; National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, G. N. Winder, president, J. M. Jones, secretary; Texas and Southwestern Cattlemens Association, Fort Worth, Tex., Holman Cartwright, president, Henry Bell, secretary and general manager; Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, Fort Stockton, Tex., Marsh Lea, president; Kansas Livestock Association, Topeka, Kans., W. J. Brown, president, Will J. Miller, executive secretary and treasurer; New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association, Albuquerque, N. Mex., E. G. Hayward, president, Horace H. Henning, secretary; Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Cheyenne, Wyo., Charles A. Myers, president, Russell Thorp, secretary; American Stock Yards Association, A. Z. Baker, president, C. B. Heinemann, secretary; National Association of Livestock Exchanges, East St. Louis, Ill., John Saunders, president, Henry Park, secretary; National Livestock Loss Prevention Board, Chicago, J. C. Cash, president, H. R. Smith, secretary; American Veterinary Medical Association, Chicago, Ill. Charles W. Bower, president, John G. Hardenbergh, secretary; United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, Trenton, N. J., J. M. Sutton, president, R. A. Hendershott, secretary-treasurer; National Assembly State Livestock Sanitary Officials, Chicago, Ill., C. P. Bishop, president, C. C. Franks, secretary-treasurer.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

ALLEGED SEDITIONISTS AND PRO-NAZI EMPLOYEE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it may be that Winchell, as an employee of the Jergens Co. and perhaps interested in a former employee of that company or of Andrew Jergens and who—the employee—entered a plea of guilty to misprision of treason came to town yesterday to ascertain the present place of residence of such employee, to bring up to date his—Jergens'—information on the subject.

If that was his purpose and he has now ascertained that one of the two former employees of Jergens is in jail and the other is interned, perhaps he will go on and explain in some of his future broadcasts what he meant when he said, in connection with the arrest of one of them, "orchids to Jergens." Did he mean that Jergens was to be congratulated in having in its employ such an individual? Did he mean that Jergens actually did something to unearth the subversive activities of such employee? If he meant the latter, why is it that he has never given us the details?

He has devoted plenty of time and space to lambasting a Congressman who gave employment to a shell-shocked World War veteran, who was subsequently led into a trap; and Winchell has given plenty of space and time to all of those who were indicted here in Washington for sedition. But he has been as quiet as a clam for many months about the subversive, the Nazi-connected activities of two of the former employees of his own boss.

Now it is quite true that Winchell referred to the arrest of a Mrs. Siddell when he spoke over the air on January 17, 1943. From a transcript of Winchell's broadcast on January 17, 1943, the following appears:

CINCINNATI.—On January 16 the Associated Press reported that the F. B. I. was holding Mrs. Margaret F. Seidel (sic), 36 years old. Mrs. Seidel, ladies and gentlemen, was in the trusted employ of Andrew Jergens, my sponsor. She is being held for investigation of violating the Enemy Alien Act. "Mr. Jergens," said the Associated Press, "aided the F. B. I. in the investigation." This is to further report that Mr. Jergens cooperated fully with the F. B. I. many months ago when complaints about Mrs. Seidel were turned over to John Edgar Hoover and Mr. Jergens by this newsboy.

Apparently, the inference which Winchell wishes to be drawn from this broadcast is that Jergens and Winchell were responsible for the arrest of Mrs. Siddell.

As stated the other day, Winchell, in connection with this matter, stated, "orchids to Jergens." Winchell, in effect, created the impression that he was congratulating his sponsor and sought to claim credit for him for the disclosure of the pro-Nazi activities of Mrs. Siddell.

Unfortunately, the record of the hearing before the alien board in Cincinnati shows that Jergens continually sought to obtain his employee's freedom and is now reported to have renewed his efforts to secure her release from an internment camp.

The Winchell broadcast, as quoted above, has all the earmarks of a clever cover-up. Winchell's subsequent conduct, his comparative silence as to the actions of this Nazi agent; his loquacity, his vociferousness in connection with the indictment of alleged seditionists all tend to show that the principal difference between the so-called seditionists and the convicted Nazi propagandist was the sum of $5,000 per broadcast paid him by Jergens.

It would seem expedient that the Dies committee, when it makes its inquiry into Winchell's smear methods, ask not only Mr. Jergens and Mr. Winchell what they know about the situation, but that they ask J. Edgar Hoover to disclose whatever facts there may be in connection with the so-called full cooperation by Jergens, and whether or not the first information as to Miss or Mrs. Siddell's alien connection came from Winchell.

In brief, let the Department of Justice, let the F. B. I., give the public as much information about these two former employees of Jergens, Winchell's sponsor, as has been given to the public time and again in connection with the charges against those indicted here in Washington for sedition.

From the press this morning it appears that Winchell has again been endeavoring to attract to himself some degree of respectability by attempting to associate his name, his activities, with the names of outstanding, decent, loyal citizens who have passed on.

The attempt to which I refer is an article by Ed Sullivan in this morning's Washington Times-Herald. It reads as follows:

LITTLE OLD NEW YORK

(By Ed Sullivan)

THE BROADWAY MADHOUSE

In an excess of modesty, Winchell compares himself with great Thomas Paine, Horace Greeley, James Gordon Bennett, William Allen White, Jacob Riis, Lincoln Steffens, and Heywood Broun, and throws in Joseph Pulitzer for good measure. Always belitting himself. Winchell, self-styled apostle of free speech, had New Yorker Editor Harold Ross barred from the Stork Club because Ross exercised free speech and razzed him in print. Because Earl Carroll exercised the right of free speech and told him to his face what he thought of him, Winchell taunted Carroll for years in print as a convict. Because I once asked Barbara Hutton to stage a Christmas party for the poor children of New York, and because she gave $5,000 for Christmas baskets for the poor, infuriating him, Winchell vilified me as a "journalistic blackmailer." Shades of Thomas Paine, Pulitzer, Steffens, Broun.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HILL was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. HILL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROWAN was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the proposed amendment for increase in the salaries of veterinarians and meat inspectors. A number of persons employed in the Union Stock Yards in Chicago in these capacities have written me and presented very cogent arguments for the adjustment of wages paid those who are doing such a splendid service to protect the people of America and her armed men and women in this great national crisis.

I beg leave to present here the straightforward statements of two meat inspectors and a woman who has been employed for some time in the Meat Inspection Division:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 22, 1944.*

HON. W. A. ROWAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to present for your consideration a few facts that may perhaps induce you to take favorable action on that part of the Department of Agriculture appropriation that provides for reclassification of the lay inspectors and veterinarians employed by the Meat Inspection Division, Office of Distribution, W. F. A.

Primarily, meat inspection is police work; that is, constant supervision of all operations connected with the production of meat and meat food products. This supervision takes the form of enforcing absolute compliance with the Meat Inspection Act, its amendments, and all regulations pertaining thereto.

Obviously, in order to enforce proper compliance, the men must maintain a high standard of technical information regarding the innumerable practices and processes involved in operating the edible departments of the meat-packing industry,

We believe that, in all honesty, we can say that in the aggregate we know the meat-packing industry as well as the packers themselves. As a matter of fact, a number of our men have resigned from the service to accept high salaried positions with the packers.

As nearly as we can ascertain, we are the lowest salaried enforcement unit in the Federal service. We feel that, in all fairness, our salaries should be comparable to others in the Federal service who carry on similar lines of work.

The quality of our work is high, and of inestimable value to the country. Through our efforts, every consumer of meat and meat food products is given protection the value of which cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Moreover, the meat packers of the country have built up a tremendous export business, in peacetime particularly, that would disappear overnight without our services.

You have our assurance that whether we get reclassified or not, the high level of our efforts will be maintained. However, we hope that you can see the justice in our desire for reclassification at a higher rate of salary.

Respectfully yours,

NATHAN OSTROWSKY,
Assistant Lay Inspector.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 14, 1944.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am employed in the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture, so I am vitally interested in the reclassification measure which is to be considered by the agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

This reclassification is of vital importance to me, due to the fact that present salary paid is low and insufficient to adequately support my family according to the present-day standards of living.

The regular deductions from my salary checks tend to reduce the actual amount of cash in hand to a great extent, and the payroll bond purchase plan, now amounting to 15 percent in my case, is in grave danger unless relief is obtained in the near future.

Meat inspection, as you know, is one of the most important branches of service, inasmuch as the public health depends solely upon the efficiency of this branch for the protection of the health of the entire Nation.

Believing that this reclassification is of the utmost importance in maintaining the required high standard of efficiency, I am respectfully soliciting whatever support you may be able to lend to this measure.

Respectfully yours,

H. D. THOMPSON.

FEBRUARY 28, 1944.

Representative WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A measure for the reclassification of employees in the Meat Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture will soon require the attention of the agricultural appropriation subcommittee. This measure has already been considered and approved by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission.

This measure is one of utmost importance to the Nation. Meat-inspection employees are responsible for the protection of the health of the people, and they are also instrumental in protecting the public from being fraudulently deceived regarding meat and meat-food products. A high degree of efficiency is required of these employees, and the reclassification measure will serve not only to maintain this efficiency, but also to attract persons of high caliber to undertake this type of work.

The present standard has been in force for many decades and has long been outmoded. Such restricted recognition of special ability and opportunity for deserved advancement has often served to lose the best employees to other more attractive services and has dulled the ambition of many who remained as meat inspectors. Monetary remuneration lags far behind that offered to employees in other closely related services.

Being a member of the Meat Inspection Service, I am naturally very much interested in seeing it brought up to date. To this end I am, therefore, requesting your wholehearted support and cooperation in contributing to the passage of the reclassification measure.

Most respectfully yours,

Mrs. CLEO V. BOBST.

CHICAGO, ILL.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, in the efforts to foster livestock production and safeguard animal products for food the following steps are indispensable:

First. Research in the laboratory and in the field to discover the causes of disease and effective safeguards, remedies, and preventives.

Second. Federal and State quarantines to confine any dangerous and infectious diseases to the smallest possible area until it can be eradicated.

Third. Cattle, sheep, and swine feeding and breeding investigations.

Fourth. Campaigns for control and eradication of widespread diseases, State by State and county by county. In some campaigns insects causing diseases such as scabies and cattle fever are eradicated. In others, such as dourine and bovine tuberculosis, the infected animals are destroyed. In hog-cholera campaigns large numbers of swine are immunized. In foot-and-mouth disease all affected and exposed animals, as well as all exposed materials, are quickly destroyed.

Fifth. Stockyards inspection: Stockyards are potential sources of inspection for serious diseases. Each year millions of animals are inspected in the yards by doctors of veterinary medicine able to detect by overlooking large numbers of animals visible symptoms of such diseases as anthrax, cattle and sheep scabies, fever ticks, shipping fever, hog cholera, swine erysipelas, and foot-and-mouth disease. Diseases found on this inspection are traced back to source, and measures are taken to prevent the spread of disease by animals to be shipped out of the yards to other points.

Sixth. Meat inspection: Ante mortem and post mortem inspection are made of each animal immediately before and at the time of slaughter, and inspection and reinspection, are required of meats and meat products and of processing. The number of animals receiving this inspection rose to 95,000,000 during the fiscal year 1943 and the number is increasing. All carcasses and parts thereof found unfit for food are condemned and destroyed, and sanitary conditions of inspected establishments are closely supervised at all times.

Seventh. International border inspection and quarantine prevent importation of diseased animals.

Eighth. Regulation of biological products eliminates all offered as remedies that are worthless, contaminated, harmful, or otherwise dangerous.

The work done by Federal doctors of veterinary medicine and their assistants in my judgment is of first importance, and unless Congress now wishes to repeal or modify the laws of long standing under which consumers receive protection against unwholesome meats and meat products and the livestock industry is aided to keep animals healthy by the control and eradication of animal diseases, I urge approval of the request of the War Food Administration for sufficient appropriations to finance the reclassification of these field services as set up by the agency authorized by Congress to establish it.

Due regard for the public interest demands that these services shall not be curtailed through failure to appropriate sufficient funds to sustain them. I urge the House to accept the amendment, so that justice will be given to the veterinarians of the country.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the great State of Wyoming, which I have the high honor to represent, is vitally interested in the Bureau of Animal Industry. This bureau was established 60 years ago, and has an enviable record for efficient service. The livestock industry is subject to a constant menace of diseases that can destroy herds and endanger the health and lives of consumers. Many diseases can be fought only by Federal and State control with the aid of veterinary science. One of the duties of the Bureau of Animal Industry is to keep livestock healthy. The fight against animal diseases must be waged all the time and requires the continued exercise of brains and skill supplied by doctors of veterinary medicine. The number of these doctors as compared with the number of livestock in this country is small, but they have made a notable record in controlling livestock diseases and parasites, and while our losses each year from these sources are large, every livestock man knows that abandoning the efforts to eradicate and prevent animal diseases would stifle the production of livestock in this country.

The inspection before and after slaughter by the Bureau and the Meat Inspection Service resulting in the elimination of carcasses or parts thereof being found unfit for food, is a distinct and vital service to the Nation. The stamp of Federal inspection is a safeguard for the protection of the consumers. All animals received at federally inspected slaughterhouses must pass two thorough veterinary inspections, one before slaughter and one at the time of slaughter, because it is only by such antemortem and postmortem inspection it can be determined whether meat is fit for food and because animals and animal products are intimately associated with human health and disease. Under the leadership of the Bureau of Animal Industry, some very devastating and dangerous animal diseases such as rinderpest have been kept out of this country.

The Bureau of Animal Industry has succeeded in eradicating foot-and-mouth disease every time it has ap-

peared in this country. There have been 7 outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States since the turn of the century. The most serious one occurred during the year 1914, and covered 22 States. During 1924 and 1925 California and Texas experienced difficulties with this disease. On January 1, 1927, the Bureau of Animal Industry in establishing a rigid embargo declared in the order "that there exists in most of the countries throughout the world the contagious and infectious diseases of animals known as rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease," and prohibited imports of meat products from any region in which either of said diseases exist. Since then a minor outbreak occurred in the State of California in 1929, and it is significant to know that this was caused by violation of the existing sanitary regulations from a ship returning from Argentina.

In dealing with diseases of this character, a tight quarantine on animals and products likely to carry infection is the only effective control. I should like to call your attention to a resolution passed by the American National Livestock Association at their annual meeting at Denver, during January of this year:

Whereas the war condition which exists in our country and the world today has brought the realization of the need for an increased meat supply and other necessary foods for the United States; and

Whereas in order that we may maintain the production of these increased meat supplies, it is of vital importance that we protect and safeguard the health of our herds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our opposition to any modification of the existing sanitary embargo applying to countries where foot-and-mouth disease and/or rinderpest exists.

Bang's disease is under better control and it is hoped that with sustained efforts by Federal and State veterinary services it may also be eradicated. I desire also to call attention to a resolution of the same association adopted at the same time on this disease:

Whereas there now exist much confusion and lack of uniformity in State sanitary regulations against Bang's disease: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Bureau of Animal Industry to adopt regulations recognizing calfhood vaccination for the movement of cattle interstate; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all States to adopt standard regulations in conformity with the standards established by the B. A. I.

Congress at this session has before it a request to appropriate about $750,000—war overtime pay included—to pay for the long-delayed reclassification of doctors of veterinary medicine and their lay assistants with promotions proposed for 977 doctors and 2,165 lay assistants. The increase requested is less than 9 percent of the current annual appropriations for the activities in which these field employees are engaged. In addition to promotions it is expected the reclassification, by making feasible deserved promotions within a reasonable time, will make possible the employment of the more competent recent graduates of colleges of veterinary medicine who have been avoiding the Federal veterinary service because it offers less compensation and less prospect of advancement than is open to them in other fields.

The efficiency of any organization will decrease unless service in it is sufficiently attractive to permit replacement of those who resign or retire with new employees, and it is inevitable that in organizations as old as the B. A. I. and Federal Meat Inspection, resignations and retirements will increase rather than diminish. These services suffered a net loss of 93 doctors during 1943, including 35 who entered the armed forces, and 19 who transferred to other Government units.

The decision which Congress is now called upon to make is whether it wants the efforts of these field services to keep animals healthy and their products fit for food to continue at its present high rate of efficiency or to deteriorate eventually because of lack of skilled manpower. Five years study are required to acquire a degree of doctor of veterinary medicine and there never have been enough of them to implement their services to the fullest extent. Lay assistants require training for varying periods depending upon their assignment and prior experience.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendments, to be considered en bloc, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 32, noes 50.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dutch elm disease control: For determining and applying methods of control and prevention of spread of the disease of elm trees known as Dutch elm disease and of a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley, $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations concerned: *Provided further*, That expenditures incurred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, or on property included within local experimental control areas: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

[Mr. MILLER of Connecticut addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $290,400 for personal services in the District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics for conducting either independently or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this subject, $806,630.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 43, line 24, strike out "$806,630" and insert in lieu thereof "$606,630."

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. TARVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment may close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TABER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe a subcommittee which has reduced an appropriation bill by 45 percent below the figures for the present fiscal year can be justly accused of extravagance. We have added in one of a few instances in the bill, an amount in excess of the Budget estimates. We were asked to add $675,000 and we added $200,000, not for the purpose of teaching canning in the home only, as indicated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] but for the several purposes which I read in connection with the question I asked of him.

We had before our subcommittee some of the leading women in this country interested in problems of the home and in home economics. I wish I had time to read the list of them to you. Their statements appear on page 1300 and the following pages of our hearings and I hope you may, before voting on this amendment, have an opportunity to refer briefly to them.

They take the position that a Congress which appropriates $17,000,000 plus, for the Bureau of Animal Industry, ought not to become parsimonious and appropriate only a very small amount for that organization of the Department of Agriculture which has to do with the problems of the home. Only $806,000 is asked here for the purpose of undertaking to deal with these problems and make certain additional research studies.

The committee unanimously approved of this after hearing the evidence. Of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has not heard the evidence and I judge from his remarks that he has not had an opportunity to read the evidence. We had statements from Miss Jessie W. Harris, president of the Home Economics Association, and many others.

Mr. TABER. I did look this stuff over. I found out by checking up that

this woman was an employee of the Department of Agriculture. I presume that is news to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no; she is director of the school of home economics, at the University of Tennessee.

Mr. TABER. I know what she said she was, but I am telling you what the fact of the situation is, that she is an employee of the Department of Agriculture. I will prove it to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. And I can assure the gentleman that he is mistaken just as he was mistaken a moment ago when he said what he did about this $200,000. The gentleman just has not read the report. Or if he has read it has not digested it. Apparently the matter was called to the gentleman's attention only a moment ago.

Then we have the statement of Miss Lita Bane, chairman advisory committee, American Home Economics Association, and head of home economics department, University of Illinois; the statement of Dr. Margaret Justin, dean of the division of home economics, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.; the statement of Mrs. Thalia Woods, executive secretary, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C.; the statement of Mrs. Bernice Finn, a homemaker from Iowa; the statement of Mrs. Edgar B. Chiswell, Jr., homemaker from California; the statement of Mrs. Waldo E. Caven, rural homemaker from New Jersey; and many others who appeared in defense of these items, whose evidence, in my judgment, is entitled to full faith and credit by this House. My only regret is that we could not have granted the increase of $675,000 instead of $200,000. If this House should cut out this small increase for this worthy Bureau and its activities in my judgment it would be a penny-wise and pound-foolish thing to do.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 49, noes 50.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. TARVER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note in reading the items on forestry in this bill that the amounts for forest fire cooperation have been reduced from the Budget appropriations for 1944 of $6,334,917 to $2,529,062, a reduction of $3,805,855. I have discussed this with a member of the committee who has informed me that he believes the existing authorization bill allows only $2,500,000 to be provided for forest fire cooperation. I should like to know the truth of this matter from a member of the committee.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this matter in the committee. I undertook to discuss it in my presentation to the House yesterday. The limit of the authorization, as the gentleman knows, is $2,500,000 to which we can add only the amount necessary to meet the overtime pay requirements of the Overtime Pay Act of 1943. It would, therefore, be beyond the power of the committee to insert any amount in the bill in excess of the authorization. As the result of this fact, it was necessary to reduce the Budget estimate by approximately $2,470,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. As my memory now serves me the appropriation bill of last year carried an authorization to the Department to incur expenditures beyond the appropriation in the event a fire occurred that required such expenditures.

Mr. TARVER. The appropriation the gentleman refers to is an item of $100,000 for fighting fires on Government lands. That is only a token appropriation. Nobody knows how much might be required. The Department goes ahead and spends whatever money is necessary, then asks for a deficiency appropriation, but that is not this item which is for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and owners of private land in the matter of fire prevention and forest-fire protection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that the language is missing from this bill that was carried in previous bills which enabled the Forestry Department to spend whatever sums were necessary for combating forest fires under the forest lands item.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is mistaken. That has not been in the bill. It is simply done as a matter of routine every year, it is put in as a token appropriation, which is supplemented by whatever funds may be necessary in a deficiency bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it not true that in previous bills there has been such language which enabled the Department to expend whatever was necessary to control fires?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no. That authority is outlined in the report and in the policy this Congress has uniformly followed of making good whatever amount may be necessary to expend in fighting forest fires on Government-owned land. The gentleman has two different subject matters in mind. One of them is the item to which he first referred, dealing with forest fire cooperation where an appropriation is made for expenditures in cooperation with the States and the owners of private land. The other is the item having to do with fighting forest fires on Government-owned land. There has never been any question so far as I know in the mind of anyone as to the procedure followed in connection with the last-mentioned item.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have sent to the document room for a copy of last year's bill, but I find there is not a copy of that bill available. However, my memory is there was such language in that bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the language of the 1944 Appropriation Act before me, and there has been no change.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In the deficiency bill that we had in here last month there was an item for quite a considerable amount—I have forgotten exactly the amount but it was in the neighborhood of a million and a half to two million dollars—as a deficiency that had been incurred. The sum varies so from year to year according to circumstances that it is absolutely impossible to figure the thing out in advance.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I am saying, and that is why I want to make certain it is possible to go ahead and expend whatever money is necessary for forest fire fighting, under the law.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is true, is it?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,092,519.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, within my own State of Ohio, and close to home, are striking examples of Nation-wide forest conditions calling for intelligent, statesmanlike action for correction. In the hill counties of southern Ohio the mineral deposits of coal and oil are rapidly being depleted. The forests of the area have been heavily used and exploited to the point where they contribute little to the welfare and support of the population. The rugged terrain and the kinds of soil existing over much of the area prevent sustained, productive agriculture. With our nonrenewable resources gone, my people will be forced by necessity to depend heavily upon the one resource capable of sustained production under the circumstances, namely, the forest cover.

Yet neither they, nor the professional foresters of the region know specifically how the forest can be brought quickly to maximum sustained productivity, nor even the level of productivity possible to attain either in terms of money or of population and industry. Nor can the professional foresters tell with exactitude the effect of the present and improved forest cover outside the area, as in terms of flood control and water yield.

Similar conditions prevail over vast areas of the United States, and this situation reflects the inadequacy of the forest research in the past. Only by painstaking study and analysis can foresters devise effective corrective measures and

bring the forests of the country to full fruition.

You are, or should be, aware that Nation-wide research in forestry is a national function; and that its effective prosecution is dependent almost entirely on funds made available in appropriations.

I will touch a little later on the returns to be expected from the research investment, but at this point I want to call attention to the magnitude of the task confronting research foresters. The 630,000,000 acres of forest land in the continental United States bears nearly a thousand kinds of trees occurring in well over a hundred recognized combinations called forest types, all sufficiently different to require individual study. Climatically, geologically, and topographically they cover almost the full range of conditions found in the country. But the problem of how to bring the forests to, and maintain them, at a high level of production cannot be solved by study of measurable physical elements alone. The solution depends also on an understanding of the relation of people and their economic affairs to the use and care of the forests and their products. As long ago as 1926 the Congress, recognizing the importance, magnitude, and complexity of a realistically adequate program of research in forestry, authorized annual appropriations of $2,575,000 for such work, exclusive of studies on forest products. As I will point out later, the largest appropriation made was only about half this amount.

As an example of the magnitude of the job I might cite the Nation-wide forest survey. For the past 10 or 12 years, region by region, we have sought to determine the existing amount of timber by kinds and the rate at which it is being used or destroyed and regrown. Despite the use of the lightest sampling consistent with reasonable accuracy, and the most energetic prosecution of the work possible with the finances available, less than half the forested area of the country has been covered by the survey to date.

The importance of the forest resource is fully commensurate with its extent and complexity. Over half a million of our wage-earning citizens in all sections of the country are directly dependent on the forest for a livelihood. In times of peace, as in 1939, the primary products of the forest were worth more than $2,500,000,000. Now their strategic importance in the prosecution of the war is inestimable and their monetary value has increased to nearly three and one-half billions of dollars. This wealth is largely harvested, moreover, not by a few gigantic industrial plants but by a host of small and moderate sized plants widely scattered. These thousands of small businesses and enterprises, and the farmers and owners of the timber areas supplying them raw materials are, perhaps, most in need of practical guidance based upon research results.

Forest Research is not a new activity in the United States, yet it has never been adequately financed. As early as 1881 a tiny appropriation was made for investigations in forestry. Further appropriations, increasing at a snail's pace, were made for the next 24 years. From 1905 to 1939 a more or less regular increase occurred, stimulated from time to time by legislation such as the McSweeny-McNary Act. In 1939 some $1,430,000 was available for research on the problems of protecting, regenerating, improving, and cutting of forests, the management of forest ranges, the effects of forest cover on run-off and streamflow, and the economic interdependence of people, forest industries, and forests. It seems appropriate here to call attention to the fact that even at the peak in 1939 appropriations were only about half of the amounts authorized by the McSweeny-McNary Act.

Since 1939, despite the fact that the war and progressive exploitation of our forests have brought them and their dependent industries to the threshold of their most critical period, this Congress has stifled the research essential to the healthy continuation of an essential, Nation-wide industry by repeatedly reducing appropriations. These reductions—savings some may call them—although inconsequential in the National Budget have had a deplorable effect on the research organization of the Forest Service. The total reduction, amounting to some 33 percent has required the closing of all research in one important forested region, and the release of some 60 highly trained professional research men. It has required abandonment of scores of small experimental forests, and indefinite suspension of record taking on hundreds of studies where continuity of records is essential to successful solution of pressing problems. In this effect it is no exaggeration to say that the reductions have led directly to the waste of previous work costing at least five times as much as the savings. In the words of a proverb of my home State—we have saved at the spigot and let it run out at the bung.

These ill effects have come right at a time when we should be bending every effort to determine how to minimize the effects of excessive cutting for war needs, how to repair the damage that inevitably has resulted over large areas, and how in the post-war period to so manage, rehabilitate, and protect our forests and range lands that they will furnish a decent American living for a large segment of our population. Without an adequate and aggressive program of research now on these broad problems many other areas and regions will, like southern Ohio, the Ozarks, and the Appalachians, be faced with a steadily diminishing base of natural resources on which to build. Moreover, it is fallacious to assume that the time lost now can be made up later. An experiment, once started, yields no results unless brought to completion, and in forestry—far more than in other sciences—time is an integral part of every study.

There is scarcely a field of human interest or endeavor in which research has not paid handsome dividends, and forest research is no exception. Yet, as in other industries, the solution of one problem begets hope for the solution of others previously considered insoluble, and the need and opportunities for continued and expanded research unfold and develop with each step of progress.

I might cite a few of these steps in the progress of forest research that point the way to what may be expected elsewhere if this activity receives the support it deserves from a body charged with responsibility for the welfare of the Nation.

In California, by careful studies, the research men learned to recognize and describe the individual ponderosa pine trees most susceptible to attack by the pine beetle. This information, translated into cutting instructions, has made it possible to harvest as healthy live timber some 85 percent of the trees that would have been killed by beetles and left to rot in the woods. The new cutting practices are being applied on large operations with consequent savings of thousands of dollars yearly.

Naval stores, turpentine and rosin, are essential components of many military items. The demands of war exceed production, and stocks were being steadily depleted; and labor and timber to step up production were not available. Research men of the Forest Service were able, however, to devise a treatment of the trees tapped so as to increase by as much as 50 percent the yield of gum from individual trees without material increase in labor. The studies, moreover, gave evidence that further increases might be possible.

In Utah, California, and the Southwest studies on the relation of forest and range-land cover to stream flow disclosed the reasons for destructive floods and the corrective measures needed on the watersheds to supplement engineering protective structures. The savings in flood damage alone promise to pay far more than the cost of the research.

Perpetuation of the forest and of its dependent industries and populations in two important regions is given greater assurance by the solution of the problems of regenerating Douglas fir and jack pine following cutting. Years of the most meticulous research were required to discover and test the treatments and conditions that will assure prompt and adequate restocking of cut-over stands of these two species. As a result, it is no longer necessary for landowners, industries, and communities to look with apprehension on the cutting of merchantable timber in the Lake States and Pacific Northwest where they grow.

Perhaps the outstanding achievement of forest research, however, is the recognition and evaluation of the critical elements governing forest fires and the development of a scientific basis for determining the degree of danger daily and planning adequate control measures. The application of these results has spread to every forest region having organized fire control. The value of timber saved, of increased resource security, and of time required to grow new forest crops, translated into dollars, will total millions.

These results, and others equally important, are taken by people in all parts of the country as assurance that their own problems will yield to study. Increasingly they are demanding that

something be done in that direction. This Congress can, and should, meet its responsibility by making the investment in forest research needed to do so.

(Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570), $2,500,000, and in addition thereto $29,062 to carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943; in all, $2,529,062, of which not to exceed $64,226 and $5,000 shall be available for personal services and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively, in the District of Columbia.

[Mr. PACE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, including not to exceed $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $4,161,496 for forest development roads and trails, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $7,500.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct my remarks to the item on page 54, line 5, entitled "Farm and other private forestry cooperation."

I do so because I want to call attention to the fact that the Plains States forestry project as now being operated by the Soil Conservation Service has been very successful in the Plains States.

I want to report to you that I have recently returned from my State, where we have a great many of these shelterbelt projects, and the trees which we planted under the old shelterbelt project are growing in an excellent manner, and the percentage of loss is negligible.

This has been one of the finest pieces of work the Government has ever undertaken. It is popular with the farmers. It is popular with the businessmen. The farms upon which these shelterbelts have been planted bring more money in the open market than farms which do not have these shelterbelt projects upon them. Therefore I want to report to you that the money that is spent in planting trees in the Plains States was wisely expended. I am happy to note that the Soil Conservation people are going to continue planting these trees on these farms. They are already bringing back into our plains wildlife and song birds. We can even cut fence posts from many of these shelterbelts. They are a wind protection. In many places they are so valuable that we no longer have to build snow fences.

I hope the Soil Conservation organization will continue planting these trees in the Plains States where we really appreciate vegetation and trees. You who have trees and vegetation cannot realize what we in Nebraska mean when we say we are a tree-planting State.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. What is so wonderful as a tree? I have not visited that part of the country, but do I understand that these trees are growing on treeless plains? Where they have not grown before?

Mr. STEFAN. Where trees have never been planted before these shelter belts are growing with a negligible loss. The Forestry Service has learned where they can plant trees and under what conditions and in what soil, and our farmers have learned through the Soil Conservation Service and the Forestry Service what kind of trees will grow on their individual farms.

Some of these trees are now 30 to 40 feet high. They are bringing us an unusual amount of happiness.

We, in Nebraska, are the followers of the spirit of the late J. Sterling Morton who was Secretary of Agriculture under the late President Grover Cleveland. At that time the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture was approximately $14,000,000. The father of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], our colleague, who was chairman of the committee, expressed horror that perhaps this bill would sometime reach $15,000,000. At one time our appropriation bill for agriculture reached over $1,000,000,000. In 1944 it was over $900,000,000. This bill comes to you with a cut of about $405,000,000 in it. While we have to save money, I hope we will continue to plant trees and do something constructive. I am glad that this particular item is left in the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I may say that the gentleman's State, with Federal aid, is probably setting an example for others, my own included. I hope the example is copied.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Nebraska make this statement, because I recall some years ago the fight the gentleman from Nebraska put up to get this amount for his State and to institute this program.

May I make the observation in the face of that fact that many of the gentleman's colleagues on the other side of the aisle labeled this as one of those fantastic New Deal experiments. I am glad the gentleman admits it has been very satisfactory.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank my colleague from Washington. May I say to the gentleman that there were not only some on our side of the House who did not believe in it, but there were some distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle who had control of these appropriations who did not believe in it either.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, of persons serving while away from their permanent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by the War Food Administration, without other compensation from the United States, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $200,000; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; $29,200,000: *Provided*, That the applicable appropriations available to the War Food Administration, current at the time services are rendered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or estimated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration, incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products for administration of such orders: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the main purpose in taking this time is to get an explanation of the proviso on page 59, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products for administration of such orders.

I want to briefly explain, if I may, Mr. Chairman, the situation that we have in my district in California. We have a number of cooperatives handling, for example, apricots, cherries, grapes, walnuts, plums, peaches, and pears. These are groups of growers who have organized to market their own products. They tell me that they are afraid that this provision would interfere with their normal operation and with the cooperation that

they get from the Department of Agriculture.

The general mechanical means of the marketing scheme is something like this: If the War Food Administrator wants to make a change in the allocation of the use of these products—for instance, pears is one of them—then he issues an order to that effect, and that order is carried out by the marketing agreement group. We have a cooperative marketing group that we call the Tree Fruit Agreement. It is allowed to assist its members to handle that work of reallocations occasioned by an order of the W. F. A. They are afraid if this proviso is retained in the bill, unless we have some assurance to the contrary, that it will not allow them to cooperate with the Department or the W. F. A., and it will not allow the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator to help them, to work with them to carry out what must be done under the orders for the reallocation of these foods.

I would like to have an explanation of it by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman and some other Members of the House brought this question to my attention today. It was not the purpose of the subcommittee to in any way interfere with the carrying out of marketing agreements of the kind to which the gentleman refers where a group of farmers or producers of their own voluntary action enter into agreements under the terms of which they assist themselves in the cost of carrying out the operations of the agreement.

I felt sure that the language contained in the proviso could not be construed to interfere with such organizations and with their operations, but after the gentleman and other Members of the House had called the matter to my attention, I requested the clerk of the committee to communicate with the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and to secure his opinion on the subject. The clerk advises me that he has stated that my conclusion was correct and that this proviso will not in any way interfere with the carrying out of the agreements of the kind in which the gentleman is concerned.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question. Would this provision prevent a man from the Department of Agriculture from going out there at Government expense and arranging with one of these cooperatives to handle the situation that the War Food Administrator wants carried on?

Mr. TARVER. The provision will prevent the War Food Administrator from issuing orders such as it has recently issued in connection with the distribution of milk, under which he undertook in various areas of the country to impose quotas on the producers and handlers of dairy products, requiring that they should not exceed in their distribution of dairy products the quota of such products distributed by them in June or December of 1943, and assessing against the distributor or handler 1½ cents per 100 pounds of milk to defray the administrative expenses for carrying out the F. B. O. order.

That is to pay a part of the administrative expenses of the War Food Administration, as we conceive it to be, and since those orders have been made effective without the consent of the producers concerned, not as the result of any marketing agreement, but simply in the exercise of an assumed power by the War Food Administration, which we do not believe it can legally use, we have inserted this proviso which will not prohibit the making of such orders, but will prohibit the assessment of the administrative expenses of the War Food Administration in administering those orders against the producers or distributors of food.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. In other words, if the producers agree to it, then this provision will not prevent them from carrying it out?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California: On page 59, line 9, change the colon to a period and strike out all of lines 10 and 11.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call careful attention to this provision in the bill. It is of immediate and immense importance to Representatives from districts where agricultural wages are paid by the hour, or from districts where fruits and vegetables are produced. If this proviso remains in the bill, it absolutely removes all the authority the War Food Administrator now has to stabilize or equalize agricultural wages. We have a stabilization of industrial wages, and we are trying to hold the line. Last year there were very few ceilings placed on fresh food commodities, that is, fruits and vegetables. This year those ceilings are being imposed at an ever-increasing rate. If those ceilings are going to be imposed and no authority is given to the War Food Administrator to place a ceiling on agricultural wages, the farmer is going to be caught in an ever-tightening squeeze that will gradually eliminate him from the picture.

Let me give you an example of exactly what I mean. Last year when this matter was first called to the attention of Marvin Jones it was during the asparagus harvesting season out in the district of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. Asparagus grows fast and has to be cut every day. There is no "do it yesterday" or "do it tomorrow" about it. It has to be cut the day it is ready. The agricultural workers who were cutting that asparagus knew it. They were able to pyramid their wages to the point where they were receiving as high as $35 per day for cutting asparagus.

This utterly unjust and inequitable situation was called to the attention of the War Food Administrator. He came out for the first time in history with a wage ceiling on agricultural wages. It effectively stopped the practice of pyramiding wages in that section, and it had a stabilizing effect on other agricultural wages throughout the entire State of California.

I am informed by the War Food Administrator, with whom I communicated only a few minutes ago, that if this proviso stays in the bill all the authority given to him under Executive Order 9322, to regulate agricultural wages, is removed and agricultural wages can go sky high. Ceilings will be placed on agricultural commodities, and the farmer will be left in the middle. I do hope the Committee will agree to accept my amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, to be used by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the item to which the gentleman from California refers and which he would want to delete from the bill had very careful consideration by the subcommittee. If I remember correctly, there was a complete unanimity of opinion on the part of every member of the subcommittee that we should not go further in the field of farm labor stabilization. This is dictated by a number of considerations.

Assuming there are some benefits in some States, yet it is aimed to apply to every State in the Union. I notice in the break-down that was supplied in connection with the justification that it would affect not only the Western States but every other State in the Union, and every commodity, where the Administrator felt there was some need for wage stabilization.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I say in that regard that in discussing this with Administrator Jones I was informed that it was applied only in two States last year, California and Florida, and that they have no intention of going into other States unless it is urgently needed in just such instances as I cited to the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I can say is that I have the justification before me, and the Administrator lists a great many States here that he believes will be in the orbit of these operations in the fiscal year 1945 for which this money will be used.

I pointed out earlier in the day the difficulties when you venture into this field, the difficulty of making an administrative determination as to what are wages, what is the entire emolument of a farm hand. Then it becomes necessary to determine the value of a rented house on the farm, the value of pigs and sheep and chickens that may be set over to the account of the man who works on the farm, the value of an automobile that is loaned to him to make trips to town. All of those questions are not academic. They have already been raised in a great many localities, including my own. In consequence, while

they had only 9 persons in January 1944, they propose here to employ a total of 241 persons in fiscal 1945 for all manner of purposes in enforcing directives by the War Food Administrator. What you are going to have is a complete domination, a complete control of all the farm labor in the country, and then you will get the usual repercussions that arise when you set one over against another. The ultimate result is going to be infinitely worse than anything I can think of if the matter were left without this type of regulation.

Those are the considerations, in the main, that have moved the committee, in addition to which we have had no testimony from any groups of farmers, any organizations of farmers, or individual farmers, in behalf of this activity, yet they are the people who would be affected by this endeavor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I join in the statement of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is true with beans the same as with the asparagus that he mentioned. The ceiling was set on the beans, and then along came labor increases. The farmer was caught in the squeeze. Today the farmers are not planting beans in my State for the simple reason that the proper protection was not given to them. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be most helpful if we hope to cooperate with the farmer and have more beans to eat. If the gentleman wants fewer beans to eat, his statement will produce fewer beans. The statement of the gentleman from California will produce more beans.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a very beany controversy.

May I conclude with this one observation, that we try to measure the disadvantages or inconveniences for the country as a whole against some inequities that may arise in some localities, and that has persuaded the subcommittee that this function of wage stabilization should be deleted.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Will not the gentleman agree with me that we ought to give the War Food Administrator some authority to correct those inequities if they are correctible?

Mr. DIRKSEN. How are you going to give him authority to correct those unless you give him authority at the same time to engage in wage stabilization for everyone in the 48 States of the Union?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. They used it very wisely and judiciously last year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In some spots that is probably true, but I am speaking of the dislocations and difficulties that might arise in many sections of the country that are only going to produce a headache for the Congress with which it is going to have to deal at some later time. In my judgment, it is far better from the standpoint of our whole farm economy that this proviso remain in the bill and that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I read with a great deal of interest the testimony of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Hutson, before the hearing conducted by this committee. I was particularly intrigued by his remarks regarding the potato situation which confronts our country at the present time. I quote as follows from the testimony of Mr. Hutson on page 1287 of the hearings:

> However, there were about 75,000,000 bushels of potatoes more than is normally grown, and to keep from purchasing potatoes we extended our price support throughout the season. There remains in the country at the present time about 70,000,000 bushels of these potatoes. That is probably more than we will be able to move unless we have perfect distribution from now until the new crop comes in, but we are trying to move some 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 bushels more than is normally used from now until the end of the late potato season.

Mr. Hutson informed the committee that the subsidy program involving potatoes would probably cost $20,000,000, or rather, involve a loss of $20,000,000. But I want to take these few minutes to direct your attention to another activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation which affects the potato industry. We recall that last spring we faced a potato shortage and so, notwithstanding the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the prices of potatoes at 92 percent of parity, a program was announced whereby incentive payments would be paid to stimulate expansion of the 1943 crop of potatoes. That incentive payment was based on 50 cents a bushel on the normal yield in excess of 90 percent up to 110 percent of the goal. On January 24 I got some figures from the Commodity Credit Corporation. I found that that one activity—not the support-price program, but the incentive payments for potatoes—would cost the Federal Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of $30,000,000. That also involved a commercial-loan program.

As the result of that incentive payment program, we had an overproduction of 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes as compared with the 10-year average of 363,332,000 bushels. The 1942 production of Irish potatoes was approximately 370,000,000 bushels, and the 1943 potato production amounted to 465,000,000 bushels.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is now confronted with an emergency which it created through the expenditure of this $30,000,000, and we find that more than 10,000 carloads of potatoes have been diverted for relief, for dehydration, for starch, and for other purposes. I am calling your attention to this fact primarily because that shows how some of these Federal agencies operate to create an emergency and then seek to justify the expenditure of additional funds out of the Federal Treasury to overcome the situation caused by their own inept policies.

In the West and throughout the country this year, we have had a dislocation of our farm program. We find that 26 of the 80 sugar-beet factories in the United States were closed during the past operating season because there was a reduction of approximately 40 percent in the production of sugar beets. This was largely caused by the incentive payments to potato growers.

We find today that we are facing a serious shortage of legume and grass seed. Why? Because when this incentive program was announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation last year, when this $30,000,000 was spent unnecessarily to induce farmers to produce potatoes—notwithstanding the fact that we had a support price which would insure the production of all the potatoes we needed—they caused this inevitable emergency. This critical situation involves the serious shortage of seeds in this country; particularly when it is desired, through various agencies, to provide some seed to help in the rehabilitation of devastated countries in other parts of the world.

It is unfortunate that Federal agencies persist in formulating unsound policies which not only defeat the intended objectives, but cause confusion. The agricultural industry could operate far more efficiently if producers were permitted to use their own judgment, based upon economic factors, instead of being subjected constantly to the whims and caprices of armchair advocates of planned economy. It is deplorable that Federal funds are used first to create emergencies, and then to overcome the effects of these same emergencies. Such practices do not contribute to the effective prosecution of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DWORSHAK was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I notice the liquidation of the guayule project that the Government, through the Department of Agriculture and the Forestry people, has been handling.

I have in my congressional district about 9,000 acres of guayule rubber plants, and at the end of this year, as I understand it, they estimate the yield per acre will be about 850 pounds of rubber. Instead of liquidation of the program completely I would like to see assistance and encouragement given to the farmers. Instead of the Federal Government being in business in the agricultural field,

the farmers themselves could actually produce the guayule rubber and sell the rubber at so much a pound, like they do in any other agricultural commodity. I have gone into this situation quite thoroughly and I find that the need for guayule rubber today is far greater than it was a year ago or even 2 years ago. The synthetic rubber needs the live rubber to make good tires. So I want to point out here today my experience in my own district with the guayule rubber plant up to date, and the visits I have made with my local people whose farms have been leased by our Federal Government. Now the Congress should encourage the Department of Agriculture to work out a proper price by the time this liquidation is complete and offer to our farmers so much per pound for guayule rubber. If there is a market for it our farmers can produce it much better, I think, than it can be bought at the present time from some of the foreign countries. So, Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to bring this to the attention of the House. I think we should all encourage the Department of Agriculture to do what they can to work out a proper price per pound now, and not wait until the liquidation date comes around, so that the farmers can actually plant more of an acreage than they have today, because I think the need is greater for the guayule plant today, as I said a while ago, than it was a year ago or even 2 years ago.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, $290,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1945, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1944 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1943, to December 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided,* That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $24,250,000 of said amount shall be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency," shall be so transferred: *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, and like programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, fertilizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants under the 1945 program; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States: *Provided further,* That no part of such amounts shall be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and other administrative expenses except for payment of obligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1944 and 1945 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local Government agency for such materials, or services, and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said act of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or contributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in activities designed to influence the action of Congress with respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except that employees may furnish to Congress any information authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by Congress, or by any of its committees or members).

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 65, line 18, after the end of the bracket, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out of the salary, per diem allowance or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire first to raise the question of whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is in order. I conceive that the amendment requires the performance of additional duties on the part of employees of the Department, in that, if I understand the amendment correctly, it would require in the case of all of the thousands of employees, administrative investigation and determination to be made as to whether any of those employees had written a letter or a postal card or done anything in violation of the requirement of the gentleman's amendment before the salary check of such employee could be issued for the month for which he was being compensated. Now it may be that the language of the proviso is technically correct, but if it is not then I desire that the point of order which I raise may be considered by the Chair. It certainly seems to me, while it is in the form of a limitation so as to be in order under the Holman rule, the effect of this is to require performance of additional duties on the part of the employees of the Department. For that reason it is legislative in character and should not be considered in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman further on the point of order if he desires to be heard.

Mr. TARVER. I do not desire to be heard further, Mr. Chairman. I have expressed my view with regard to the matter and I am willing to abide by the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] on the point of order.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I submit that the argument of the gentleman does not point out anything except that this is a limitation. It does not require any duty on the part of any of the A. A. A. officials. It simply prohibits payment when this thing has been done. It simply acts as a safeguard so that the A. A. A. officials who want to enforce this act, who do

not want these things to be done, could withhold payment when it has been done.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. How are those authorized to pay the salaries of these employees to ascertain whether these employees have written a letter or a postal card as prohibited in the gentleman's amendment? Will it not be necessary to make an investigation in each case every month?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; of course it would not. If this amendment is adopted it will stop this practice. These people will not do it.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is just figuring on everybody being good because he tells them to be?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Well, that is true. If your argument is sound, any limitation will require the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is prepared to rule. The proviso offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] in the opinion of the Chair is a limitation and the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we are endeavoring to finish consideration of the bill this afternoon if that is possible.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman insists on his objection I will have to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman has a right to do that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have the same right to make that point that you have.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. I said the gentleman has a right to do that. I have not objected. I was simply reserving the right to object. I trust the gentleman will wait until the conclusion of my statement before he becomes aroused.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Why waste time?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, I think not. The gentleman is more expert at wasting time than I.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But not as often.

Mr. TARVER. I would not object to the gentleman having 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that he may proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object to that. If the gentleman requests 3 additional minutes, I shall not object.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-three Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think all the Members are familiar with this amendment and with the bureaucratic abuses which this proposal is designed to correct. Its purpose is to outlaw what appears to be the common practice of A. A. A. officials in the field of coercing our farmers to join the triple A program in order to get gasoline, farm machinery and implements, and other essential commodities; and to qualify for draft deferments as essential farm workers.

If there is a shred of doubt in the mind of any Member that such shameless abuses are occurring, I think I shall convince you with the few bits of evidence selected from my current mail from victims among my constituency that these coercive practices actually do prevail.

To those of you who may argue against my amendment in the mistaken belief that to do so is to defend officials and official policies of this administration, let me say that the Selective Service System, the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Price Administration all agree that the emergency powers of the executive agencies should not be, and must not be, used as weapons to force compliance with the philosophy and policies of the triple A. They all agree that triple A compliance, at least in theory, is purely voluntary. They all point out that no agent of the Executive, by any stretch of the imagination, may penalize any individual who declines to participate in triple A, or to embrace its doctrines and policies.

If the spokesmen for these agencies mean what they have said in informal reports to me, then there should be utterly no objection to the amendment I have proposed. They do not authorize these practices. They do not condone them. They even assure me, in fact, that they are anxious to prevent them.

The officials of Selective Service have investigated the obvious violations which have occurred in cases which I brought to their attention. They have been quick to correct the mistakes which have occurred, and I believe they are entirely sincere in their assurances that they do not want the Selective Service Act prostituted for the promotion of some particular New Deal ideology. I think that Selective Service should be given a clean bill of health in this matter, for I am convinced that these abuses occur through no fault of draft headquarters. I would like to say that the local draft board, in the case which I have exposed, is not primarily at fault. I think its members have simply been the unwitting victims of ardent New Dealers on the local triple A committee, who sold them a sorry bill of goods. It should also be said in credit to this draft board that it was quick to correct its original mistake when it was called to attention.

The fact remains, however, that these glaring violations have occurred, and are occurring, not only in my own State and district, but all over the country.

I want to read you a letter sent to me by a number of farmers residing in Grant County, Ind., which is in my district. This letter, I understand, was mailed to all draft-age men in that county holding agricultural deferments, or who had applications for deferments pending before the board. Please listen to this carefully, because I know you will find it interesting and significant:

GRANT COUNTY LOCAL BOARD No. 2,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Marion, Ind.

I have been reading the heading of the letter—

DEAR SIR: You are hereby directed to report to the U. S. D. A. War Board at the office of the A. A. A. in Marion, Ind., within 5 days—

This next line is emphasized because it is capitalized and underscored—

after you have signed up at your township A. A. A. meeting and obtain a certified copy of your 1944 production.

Bring this certified copy to this office.

It is very important that you obtain this certificate as directed, since in its absence you may be placed in class I–A and held for military service.

This is signed "Grant County Local Board No. 2, 228 Post Office Building, Marion, Ind."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Briefly.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman's amendment would not correct that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it will correct it, because it is perfectly obvious——

Mr. PACE. That is from the Selective Service.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I know it is, but remember I have said this is not really a draft-board creation. I think the draft board has in this instance been victimized by the local A. A. A.

Mr. PACE. That is not in this bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it is perfectly obvious that there was a mutual understanding, a working agreement between triple A authorities and this local draft board. Otherwise, I am sure that local board would never have sent out such a letter. Those men on that local board are good, patriotic Americans who are, I assure you, doing a good job. They have been working under terrific pressure, and they have simply been hoodwinked when they turned to triple A for help. Had they seen the matter in true perspective, I feel sure they never would have sent out such a letter.

Let me read you now a letter from another Grant County farmer, a resident of the same county:

DEAR MR. HARNESS: You have our utmost support in your fight against bureaucratic

methods used by the Government to force joining the triple A, by leaving no alternative by which they, the farmer could have his points counted.

And it is very true that they did this thing. Back 2 years ago, my two sons and myself were farming almost 600 acres of Grant County, Ind., land in Liberty township. The draft board came along and took Clyde, so not being able to get help we were forced to let 260 acres go. So my other son is running his land and I am running my farm land with no outside land. We have been unable to get permission to buy new tools. The son at home has been called up and questioned time after time by the draft board, yet his operations show 54 points. I saw and talked to Glenn Smith, a member of the triple A board. I asked him, "Is it true that a farmer has to be a member of the triple A to have his points count?" He answered, "Yes, as the program was in danger of failure because no one, that is, few cared for it no longer."

I then asked this gentleman: "Is that democratic?" He answered, "Why democratic. This is war and the President must rule." I then asked, "Are you going to force the farmers in line?" He answered, "We must, as they will not go along with the administration any other way; they will raise too many hogs and no tomatoes. The hogs we do not want but the tomatoes we must have." I then asked, "Don't you think the farmer has sense enough to run his own business?" His answer was a short, "No." My son was forced to sign up the triple A program or go to war."

I have had many, many other complaints. The special draft deferment committee, of which I am a member, will meet Monday morning with triple A and selective-service officials in the hope that we can stop this nefarious practice. I do not know why any draft official or any triple A official should say to a farmer, "Before you can obtain a deferment you have got to join this program and farm as we want you to farm or else we will railroad you into the military service." Nor is there any reason why any triple A agent should require as a condition that a farmer should join the triple A before he could get a new tractor or a new plow or get gasoline to operate his farm machinery.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Who selected this draft board in the gentleman's district that he complains of? How was it selected?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I believe the gentleman knows who selected the draft board and how it was selected. I say that the vast majority of the draft boards have done a fine, patriotic job and I bring no charges against this particular board.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What in the world has this administration, in the sense the gentleman seems to use when he wrote that letter, to do with the draft board when it was selected the way it was?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the letter from the draft board and what is happening in these various counties through triple A groups speak for themselves.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Supplementing what the gentleman has said, on yesterday I put into the RECORD a card which had been received by another farmer in the State of Indiana. After the writer of the card had discussed the 1944 farm plan he used this language—and remember the card came from the Department of Agriculture—

A recent ruling provides that future nonhighway gasoline allotments will be based on your completing this farm plan.

Those cards are being sent promiscuously to the farmers throughout my district of Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. During the course of the last year I have had numerous complaints from farmers in Indiana and elsewhere that these triple A agents in our farming States were forcing men to come in and sign up with the A. A. A. program before they could get rationed articles and commodities. I submit, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason under God's heaven for such a thing in this terrible time of war. We must ration many commodities, of course, and they should be rationed fairly and justly; but to use this war and the draft to coerce and compel men to go along with a program with which they are not in favor is, to say the least, reprehensible. I hope you will support this amendment.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CAMP. This program was formulated by the War Food Administration. No war food program has been made by the triple A. I think the writer of the letter read by the gentleman from Indiana was referring to something other than the triple A.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Oh, no! No, indeed! We all understand that W. F. A. is proposing a quite comprehensive farm production program. No one that I know of objects to that, and I think American farmers almost universally have cooperated 100 percent. I am not talking about national food production planning, nor about the willingness of farmers to produce tremendously for war. I am simply talking about triple A, which we all know is entirely another matter. Triple A is that old, old hangover from days when we were trying to kill pigs, plow under corn and cotton, and restrict farm production. And triple A and this whole old New Deal philosophy of keeping the iron heel on the neck of the farmer is the sole source of trouble in this present instance. I could submit evidence from my own files for a week to show you that this is purely New Deal dictatorship at work in the field. I expect the Members representing every other farming district in the country could do the same. I hope the gentleman will help me correct this glaring intrusion of New Deal ideology. I hope the House will help me correct these unforgivable abuses.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure; and I fear the gentleman from Indiana is not quite sure as to whether he is complaining of alleged maladministration in the triple A, the War Food Administration, the Selective Service System, or the War Manpower Commission. All that he is satisfied about is that somebody is doing something that he ought not to undertake in the way of trying to coerce farmers to enter the triple-A program by threatening them with the loss of their gasoline or the induction of their sons into service if they do not do so-and-so in accordance with administrative orders.

This matter has not been called to my attention until a day or so ago, when one or two Members of the House commenced reading postal cards and letters they claimed had been sent out by some employees of the Department of Agriculture in the field. I think this House would be taking a remarkable step to undertake to legislate upon the basis of this scattered information if indeed it be information at all until witnesses are called before a committee of this House and have established by their evidence what the truth of this may be. I remember that last year I was concerned because an employee of the War Manpower Commission in my district had sent out notices to farmers in that area which in my judgment threatened them with induction into military service unless they reported and went to Florida to perform agricultural labor.

I thought that conduct on the part of that employee was outrageous and had the facts placed in the hearings of the committee which was considering the appropriation for agricultural labor; but I did not offer an amendment to hamper the handling of all the administrative funds of the War Manpower Commission on that account. I think there ought to be some way to correct administrative abuses on the part of minor employees in the field without undertaking to hamper the payment of salaries of thousands of employees of the Department of Agriculture. If you will read the language of this amendment it applies to every appropriation carried in this bill, not merely to the appropriation for conservation and use of agricultural resources.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not believe the gentleman meant to say just what he did. Certainly there is nothing in this amendment that will hamper this program in any way. If the triple A officials in Washington are sincere when they tell us they do not approve of this

method being used by some of their committeemen they should stop it. This is one means they can use to stop it. When the gentleman argues to this House that this is going to injure the program he is going too far.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. The gentleman wants us to place in this bill a provision which applies to every employee of the Department of Agriculture, because it is a restriction on all of the funds in this bill; and he wants us to do that on the basis of two or three letters and postal cards that in themselves have never been brought to the attention of any committee of this House. I feel that before we do anything of this kind some committee ought to consider the matter carefully and take evidence with regard to it both from those who complain and from the officials of the Department.

If an amendment of the kind the gentleman proposes should be adopted it can be done in the Senate. The Senate will have an opportunity to hear the evidence and to do what it thinks is wise. Our committee would have been glad to have heard the evidence if it had been presented. You will note from the bill that we have included here a very stringent provision against the carrying on of political activities by any of the employees of this organization. We are not averse to the making of reasonable restrictions based upon evidence which justifies them, but we are averse to the insertion here of a provision which, as I have said, restricts the Department with reference to every dollar carried in its bill for personnel by a requirement which may or may not be necessary but which certainly has not been established so far as being necessary by evidence submitted to any congressional committee.

I hope we will not act hastily in this matter. There is plenty of time for the insertion of such a proviso in the bill, and a carefully worded provision if one be necessary at all in the further consideration of the bill in the Senate. We should not now hastily and upon the basis of some two or three complaints undertake to make a legislative provision of this importance a part of this appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how late does the gentleman contemplate running this evening?

Mr. TARVER. I think after we conclude this amendment it will be my purpose to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request applies only to this particular amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The request was as to this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House and for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia, I would like to advise that in Ohio in the last 2 or 3 weeks there have been many instances in which farmers have been called upon to join the A. A. A. and they have been told that it is necessary to sign up for the A. A. A. program in order to obtain needed gasoline for farm production and use.

I am thinking of one particular instance in Seneca County, Ohio, where nearly 100 farmers met in protest, and a riot almost developed. I personally took up the matter with Mr. Harrison, Chief of the Gasoline Rationing Division of the National Office of Price Administration, and he told me that many similar complaints had reached the O. P. A., that he was fearful the practice had been followed, which, of course, was contrary to the O. P. A. regulations and that a check-up would be made.

The next day I received a communication from Mr. Harrison containing a number of copies of a new order or regulation issued by Mr. Phillips, I believe his name was, Chief of the Fuels Division of O. P. A., to all district and division officers of the Office of Price Administration, warning them that it was unnecessary and illegal for any requirement to be placed upon farmers or other individuals obtaining extra allotments of gasoline, and that the practice should be stopped if at all possible. That is from the angle of the Office of Price Administration. That Office seemingly admits this practice of which the gentleman from Indiana complains has been followed.

In order to support that order of the Office of Price Administration and to assist them in carrying it out and making it effective, I believe that we must follow this other approach suggested by the gentleman from Indiana and adopt the pending amendment so as to prohibit from the agricultural side the members of the A. A. A. organizations in the various States and counties from following this practice. If we take action through this amendment against O. P. A. and A. A. A., then perhaps we will have it stopped.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. When I was at home last summer in California I was informed by certain farmers in the San Fernando Valley that they were being practically required to join A. A. A. in order to obtain orders from the War Production Board for repair parts to farm equipment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that is true also. Let me say that in my own home county, the local ration board has issued a public statement saying that they were not following the practice that had been complained of in other counties in Ohio and that they would not put that requirement upon the farmers of that county that they could not get gasoline without joining the A. A. A. Of course, that is an admission on their part that that practice is being followed in other counties. Therefore I think the amendment is necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The practice is not new by any means. Several years ago the Federal loan agency making loans to farmers had printed in the application for loan the statement that the borrower must agree, as long as the principal or any interest on it was unpaid, not to say anything against the A. A. A.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Regardless of how long the practice has been followed, it is a reprehensible thing and should be stopped. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I want to add that I am receiving letters from farmers in my district complaining of this practice that is now being discussed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My purpose was simply to show that this is not an accident. It is an old, definite, well established policy to use Government funds to force the farmers into the A. A. A.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, it is premeditated, it is done knowingly and purposely and should be stopped by action of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, if there are those in this House who believe that some sort of compulsory program for farmers is necessary either in peacetime or during war in order to obtain production from our farmers then they should vote against this amendment; but if you believe that all of these farm programs should be a voluntary matter with the individual farmer and that he should have the right and privilege of exercising his own free will and discretion as to whether he signs up with the A. A. A. as they express it, or any other farm program promulgated by the Department of Agriculture or any other governmental agency, then certainly you should vote for the pending amendment.

For several months I have been receiving letters at various intervals from different sections of my district to the effect that practices were being put into effect that before a farmer would be considered eligible for gasoline or before his request for draft deferment would be considered either for himself or laborers on his farm or before his requests would be considered for farm machinery or be eligible for soil-conservation payments he must sign up with the A. A. A. or subject himself to some agricultural Gov-

ernment agency to ascertain the facts in respect thereto. I wrote a good many people in order to get some concrete evidence. I had no reason to disbelieve these statements because men whose reputation was above reproach told me that these things were actually going on in some counties in Oklahoma.

I took the matter up several times with the A. A. A. officials here in Washington and they assured me there was no foundation for those statements, but that if such practices did exist, of course, they ought to be corrected. Day before yesterday I received from a merchant in my district a letter, and for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia who doubted whether these requests were coming from the A. A. A., he sent me the card that was sent out by the regular A. A. A. committee. I have the card in my office, not with me presently. I put a part of the card in the RECORD on Tuesday of this week. The card in itself does not say that they must sign the work sheet to which it refers, in order to receive draft deferments or in order to receive farm machinery; but the card does contain certain language which is being construed not only by the farmers who are getting the cards but by many of the committees such as the local O. P. A. and others, and in some instances the local draft boards, that it does mean that very thing.

That card says:

> Your community committeeman will be in Hawley on March 17 to assist you in executing your 1944 farm plan sheet and to explain 1944 practice payments that can be earned on your farm.

It follows with this language:

> These plan sheets will be used to secure information for draft deferments and securing farm machinery.

Now let us be fair. What construction would you or anyone else put upon that sort of language when contained in a card coming from the local A. A. A. committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman, if that is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask, in all fairness, what other construction could be put upon it? Why put this in the farm plan sheet about farm machinery or about gasoline or about farm deferments? I called the head of the southern division of triple A in my State, when I got this card, and he said that this language about draft deferment or farm machinery had no business being in there and that he would immediately take it up with the State director. He called me this morning and told me that he had taken it up with the State director and that the State director said it had no place on the card and that the State committee would give proper publicity to this erroneous implication and make it crystal clear that farmers who did not or had not been members of the A. A. A. should not be discriminated against in respect to securing fair consideration for farm machinery, draft deferments, or gasoline.

This amendment will help to correct the situation if it is adopted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If it is true that the officials of the triple A, the officials of Selective Service, and the officials of the Office of Price Administration contend that this is a wrong practice, then what can be wrong by adopting this amendment to try to stop it?

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly there cannot be anything wrong. As I said in the beginning, if we want a free program in America for the farmers, and let the farmers use their own discretion about these matters, then certainly this amendment should be adopted. Of course, if there are those who believe we must have a compulsory program of some kind, then vote against the amendment. Personally I cannot subscribe to governmental compulsion for the farmers or any other group of our citizens.

(Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have received letters from farmers in my district complaining that they are being coerced to sign up with the triple A before they are allowed to have any gasoline. I do not know why anybody should doubt that this practice is being carried on. From the time the Triple A Act was passed this agency has continuously resorted to coercive measures to force all farmers into its program. Could there be any worse coercion than the procedure of levying a penalty on farmers for growing more wheat than suits the Washington bureaucracy? Who would have thought in 1887 that the time would ever come when the commerce clause of the Constitution would be construed so as to allow a bureau here in Washington to tell a farmer how much wheat he could plant?

This is a good amendment. As has been stated here before, there is no reason in the world why it should not be adopted. This practice should be stopped. The people of this country are arriving at a stage where they are beginning to resent in no uncertain terms the coercion and regimentation that this administration has forced upon them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Accounts Committee, for the courtesy extended me in allotting me his time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. What I wanted to talk about was the entire proviso. If the Members of this House will read that proviso, I venture the assertion that no one will say that he ever saw a proviso of that character tacked onto an appropriation bill before.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the mail I received a letter sent out by the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley, Calif., signed by Walter R. Goldschmidt, associate social science analyst. I should like to read this letter:

> Miss Vera Christie of the bureau of occupations of the University of California submitted the names of several recent graduates dwelling in the upper San Joaquin Valley who she felt might be interested in taking short-term employment. Your name was among the list. I am writing you to ask you if you would be interested to work for approximately 6 to 8 weeks under the conditions to be set forth below and to ask that you respond to this request at your very earliest.
>
> The work I have in mind is taking schedules or questionnaires from residents in the communities of Arvin (Kern County) and Dinuba (Tulare County). The schedule is designed to get information on the standard of living and the social participation of a cross section of the total population in each of these towns. The work is to begin the latter part of this month, preferably around the 23d. It will last approximately 6 weeks to 2 months. The pay rate will be $202.76 per month; in addition to this you will receive $5.60 per diem for each day you are away from home. During wartime all Government employees work 48 hours a week. If you have a car at your disposal it would be advantageous to use it. You will receive compensation for the use of the car at the rate of 5 cents a mile, and we will arrange through your local ration board for the gasoline.
>
> If you are interested in this employment please respond at once and indicate the following facts: (1) your age; (2) the courses you have taken in the social sciences while at the university; (3) any pertinent occupation experience you have had; (4) the date on which you will be available for work; (5) whether or not you have a car which you can use. I will be in the neighborhood of your community on or about the 21st of March and if you are interested in this employment I will interview you at that time.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> WALTER R. GOLDSCHMIDT,
> *Associate Social Science Analyst.*

Here we are telling the farmers that they cannot have gasoline, and we have another group spending the same farmers' money running around digging into everybody's business, trying to find out how some people live. I am wondering at this particular time just where we are heading. Here are the taxpayers of the Nation, and you are asking them to produce food in great quantities. You are asking their cooperation, and then we turn around with the Department of Agriculture, right out of our own Federal bureau here, setting up one of the silliest things I ever heard of.

In my State we do not have to have somebody running around asking people how they can live. We are living all right out there. If some of these bureau heads would just tend to their own business and let the farmers operate their own business once in a while, we would get along a whole lot better. Some silly

professor, some dreamer, some man who knows nothing about agriculture, knows nothing about the living conditions of the farmers and the people who work there, is doing this. I venture to say there is not a State in the Union that has better facilities for the farmers than they have in the State of California or for the laborers who work on the farm. But here we are going to take the taxpayer's money, gasoline we do not have, tires we do not have, and money that we do not have to support some childish dream.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, certainly I do not approve wrongdoing on the part of any official of the Department of Agriculture, but I think it might be helpful if we have a better understanding of what these funds are to be used for.

It was mentioned here that somebody is trying to make somebody else join the triple A. There is no such thing as a triple A program today except in tobacco. There are no controls of production on any crop except tobacco, and that control remains only because we now need food more than we need smoking and chewing tobacco.

It is also presented here as if there were some compulsion if a farmer signs a work sheet. I think you understand that we have two acts. We have the Soil Conservation and the Domestic Allotment Acts, and this language that you now have before you confines this money to soil conservation and water conservation payments. So if a farmer signs a work sheet, there is no penalty attached to it, there are no taxes involved, there is no control involved. All he does is say, "I think at this time I will be able to plant so many acres of wheat, so many acres of corn, and so many acres of soybeans." If he does not plant these crops there is no penalty, there is no tax. The most he could possibly lose would be the payments he would have earned if he had carried out the practices. If he decides he does not want to carry out the practices, that ends the matter.

You speak of making a man join the triple A as you would of making him join the Army, subject to somebody's orders. There are no orders or penalties today in agriculture except in tobacco, where there is a penalty if there is excess production, because most all of the tobacco producers asked for it. But get it clear that there is no compulsion in the farm program today, with this one exception.

What I think these notices mean—and whatever you do I shall make no complaint—is that if the draft board wants to know if you have 16 units, they go to that record to find it out. If you do not want to supply the information there, you can show them and make your proof in some other way.

However, I intended to use my time to correct the impression that seems to exist here that we now have an enormous triple A program when we do not; that we have an enormous compulsory program when you do not. Now, if you want to throw up some terraces, you can earn five or ten dollars. If you want to plant some cover crops and turn them under and build up your soil, you can earn five or ten dollars. If you want to apply some lime or some phosphate, you can earn five or ten dollars. That is what this money is for, but you do not have to do it, and there is no compulsion about it.

Some of you gentlemen seem to think that the mere act of asking a farmer to make out and file his intention or work sheet, merely to indicate what crops he intends to plant and the acreage of each, is a terrible thing to do. Maybe it is, but it seems to me that such cooperation is not too much to ask when our Nation is at war, when our national existence is at stake, when millions of our boys are out on the battle lines of the world offering and giving their lives in order that these same farmers may keep their farms and enjoy the safety and comfort of their homes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this really is not new except as it applies to the draft. Last summer one of my constituents came to me all excited. He was very much agitated about the O. P. A. When the second and third one came along, I asked if they would not bring me the letter they had received from the O. P. A. so I would know what their troubles were. I will not read the entire letter, but the last sentence says:

> You are hereby notified that unless you take immediate steps to remedy the situation your permit will be suspended within 10 days.

For as many years as I can remember everyone in my county has butchered their hogs or their cattle for the local butchers when they so desired. Here this man comes along and sends them this letter saying they have to have a new slaughterhouse within 10 days or he will take their permit away from them—even at a time when one could not find any lumber to build with and no one available to erect a building. I found out that he was merely a meat-marketing supervisor under the Food Distribution Administration. I later found he was receiving $3,800 per year, the best job he ever held and over twice as much as he formerly received before entering Government service. I said that the only thing to do first was to have a meeting and find out what it is about. I said that I did not know of any authority of law that gave him any right to send them that letter.

I arranged a meeting that week and some 50 small butchers and farm butchers were there, and the gentleman himself was there. He said that his superior officer told him that he guessed he should not have written that letter. That is what we always find when we get small men in big places. He had to write the letter to show his authority. At that meeting he kind of wrapped the flag around himself two or three times and got himself all heated up, but when it was over with he decided not to insist on that 10 days' time limit for building.

At that time I told these people that it happened that the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, and I had served together 2 years in the House, and I said that I knew Marvin Jones too well to know that he would want to follow this kind of procedure.

When I came back here I took it up with the Department and wrote Mr. Hendrickson, who was head of the F. D. A. at that time. I ended the letter by saying this:

> The way the farm butchers and the local butchers have been harassed by the Food Distribution Administration is rendering a disservice to the war-food program. If a "small fry" like this has any authority to write the kind of letters he does, I want to be so advised, and if he does not, I want him to immediately cease. I recommend that he put on a pair of overalls and help produce the food instead of continuing in a useless position hindering the people who are producing the food to win the war.

After many weeks of correspondence with Mr. Hendrickson in which I had insisted on having him state the law that gave his man any authority to write the letter in the first place—you should be interested in this reply, since it would also apply to gas and machinery:

> In reply to the specific questions raised in your letters, the authority of the Food Distribution Administration to establish regulations with respect to the slaughtering of livestock is based upon title III of the Second War Powers Act which specifies that, upon a finding by the President that war requirements will result in a shortage in the supply of any material, he shall allocate or distribute such material in a manner deemed appropriate or necessary in the public interest and to promote the national defense.

Here then is the Executive order that has been interpreted to cover most everything, or it so appears. This is one more example of what happens when Executive orders are used instead of laws passed by the Congress. These actions harm the war-food program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—Ayes 58, noes 96.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 88.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 89, noes 69.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order after the direction for the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous ruling of the Chair, the point of order is overruled.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 70, noes 88.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 65, noes 90.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. Tellers have been ordered.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 93, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4443, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech I had intended to present during discussion of an amendment now pending on the desk.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader with reference to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, the O'Hara bill, H. R. 3592, a bill to prevent multiple taxes on salaries of the Federal employees. Two hours general debate has been provided.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, H. R. 4381, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, on which 2 hours debate has been allowed.

H. R. 4257, a bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service.

Then if the Rules Committee reports out a resolution creating a post-war military committee, that bill will be taken up also. I have no knowledge now of any other bill for next week.

I ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Several requests have been made of the Committee on Rules for hearings on several resolutions and bills. The committee will meet tomorrow morning. What action the committee will take I do not of course know. I believe the Committee on Naval Affairs is anxious for a rule on a bill to take care of some adjustment of promotions.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot put that on the program for next week. What is the other bill the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. MICHENER. The other bill is the admiral's bill. A similar bill is pending in the Committee on Military Affairs as I recall for the generals. I think it is a most controversial matter.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know.

Mr. MICHENER. I feel that it should not come up until after recess.

Mr. SABATH. I promised them all I would give them a hearing tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I have announced now will be the program for the coming week. Any other bills that are disposed of will have to be handled by unanimous consent.

Mr. MICHENER. Then it is the purpose to recess about the 30th until after Easter?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the purpose then to recess—Thursday or Friday, Friday at the latest, but the strong hope is Thursday—until a week from the following Tuesday, which I think will be April 11. There will be no legislation scheduled for the 11th or 12th but it is the purpose to bring up the naval appropriations bill on the 13th.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my own remarks and insert therein several speeches I have heretofore made and some resolutions I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 49 of yesterday, on the U. N. R. R. A. bill, I am recorded as voting "no." I voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 49 of yesterday on the U. N. R. R. A. bill I am recorded as voting "no." I was present and voted in the affirmative. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may address the House for 20 minutes after completion of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 19, entitled "Duggan Logical Choice."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE MYRON SELZNICK

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, a great American and one of the most distinguished residents of my district passed away today. Myron Selznick is a name known wherever American films have been shown, and that is all over the world.

Associated with the industry since its earliest days, Myron Selznick has been responsible, in no small measure, for the phenomenal success, for the incredibly wide acceptance of American motion pictures. He had an uncanny judgment as to what the public wanted. His skill was his ability to understand the American taste.

The art of motion pictures is one of the most democratic art forms yet devised. Paintings and sculpture have historically been what the king liked, or what a small group of experts liked. Motion pictures are what the mass likes.

The strength of Myron Selznick was that he never lost touch with the American people. He was one with 130,000,000. The entertainment industry is the less because Myron Selznick is no longer with us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include certain communications.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the point where the Dirksen amendment was under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter and a memorandum from the Director of the Automotive Supply Rationing Division.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole excerpts from the report from which I quoted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain correspondence in reference to the subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] may extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein pertinent excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE FAIR GOVERNMENT PRACTICES ACT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time, today, in order that I may express my views and make some observations respecting H. R. 4314, which was recently introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. While this proposed measure, as presented, may not be in the specific form finally desired by the House, I am constrained to believe that as a general policy the basic principles set forth in H. R. 4314 are sound, very desirable, and highly essential.

During this war, and the hysteria which follows by reason of the eagerness to win an early victory, we have been lulled into a state of lethargy with respect to our own home front. We have been struggling with the problems of war; we are confronted with the hysteria of war; we think, live and dream of this war—the most frightful of all wars—the war which we must win, and the war which our Army and Navy are slowly, but surely, winning. We realize that we must win this war as quickly as possible in order to save the lives of our men and boys who are engaged in it, and we recognize that as quickly as the war is ended we must begin the process of rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to speak upon this subject, today, because it relates to our own domestic and economic policy. Our own affairs on the home front are too often overshadowed by those of the many battle fronts, and we are led astray from our own situation on the homeland by reason of the exigencies developing on the battle fronts. However, we must mark well our own progress at home. This is the arsenal of production for the war. We must not yield to any policy which will, in any measure, retard or slow down that production. We must ever reflect upon the necessity of maintaining production and the morale and courage of our people—of our businessmen, our farmers, our workers in the factories and mills, in fact every American citizen on the home front, in order to lend aid to the prosecution of this war on every battle front.

Mr. Speaker, it has been reported, quite recently, that during the last 10 years the Congress has enacted 4,553 laws, and during that same period of time President Roosevelt has issued and put into effect 3,703 Executive orders and directives. This is startling information. While this is a Government by law and not by men, yet we find that the President has, by his own Executive orders, almost equalled the stride of the Congress. He is a very close second to this great legislative body in the issuance of orders which take the force and effect of law, yet the Congress has had no part in the declaration of the policy pronounced in those Executive orders, and, in fact, the Congress did not know anything about them until they were announced from the Executive Office. The regulations and rules which are issued and promulgated by the boards, bureaus, and agencies, largely created by Executive order, are myriad and some of those rules and regulations clothe the issuing board, bureaus, or agency with the power, or, at least, the power is assumed, to impose penalties of both fine and imprisonment upon the people of this country, many of whom did not know of the regulation, misunderstood it, or had been misinformed regarding it. Such a ridiculous condition should not have been countenanced in the beginning, and, certainly, it should not be permitted to continue longer. Ours is a Government by law, duly enacted by the Representatives of the people, and not by Executive orders and directives, and not by rules and regulations issued by some board, bureau, or agency of Government.

Mr. Speaker, when we come to realize that the Executive orders and directives issued by the President during the past 10 years are almost equal in number to the laws which were passed by the Congress in that same period of time we are appalled by that unparalleled situation. If that unprecedented practice is continued, and increases, it can result in practically all of the governing power, under the guise of law by Executive orders and directives, coming from the pen of one man—the President of the United States—and without the Congress, the representatives of the people, having either knowledge or voice in legislation. Such a policy amounts to one-man government. Under that plan the representatives of the people have had no part in making the laws by which they are governed. In many instances our people have found themselves confronted with charges for violations of rules and regulations with which they were entirely unfamiliar, and they were tried before the board, bureau, or agency through

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(Issued March 25, 1944, for actions of Friday, March 24, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

AAA....2,22
Adjournment....5
Administrative law....13
Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed)....1
Appropriations....1,6
Banking and currency....12
Budget Bureau....14
Cotton investigation....28
Flood control....4,27
Food distribution....36
Food production....15,28
Forestry....16,30
GAO....6
Loans, farm....7
Machinery, farm....29
Personnel....6
Plant diseases....14
Post-war planning....24
Price control..15,19,20,33
Priorities....37
Prosecutions....31
Rationing....22,34
Research....14,23
Rubber....23
Selective service....35
Subsidies....19
Taxation....18
Transportation....17,32
TVA....6
Vehicles....6
Veterans....7,21,25
Water conservation..26,27

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 4443 (pp. 3067, 3068-84).

Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Cannon, Mo., to provide that in case of a State agency authorized to enter into soil-conservation agreements with U. S. agencies, SCS projects must have the approval of such agency before they can be undertaken (p. 3075).

Agreed (in the House, by a 171-135 vote) to the Harness amendment prohibiting demands that persons join the AAA program in order to get deferments, gasoline, etc. (pp. 3083-4). Previously the House had agreed to a request by Rep. Taber, N. Y., that the Record be corrected to change "of" to "for" in this amendment (p. 3067).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Cochran, Mo., to strike out the prohibition against political activities, lobbying, etc. (pp. 3068-9).

By Rep. Rees, Kans., to limit individual AAA payments to $500 (pp. 3069-75).

By Rep. Boren, Okla., to prohibit REA from financing electrification for persons now receiving central service, and to prohibit REA from financing generating plants, etc., in populated places with more than 1,500 inhabitants (pp. 3080-3).

Rep. Murdock, Ariz., discussed soil conservation on Indian reservations (p. 3076). Rep. H. C. Andersen, Minn., discussed the farm-machinery situation (pp. 3076-7). Rep. Voorhis, Calif., discussed the market news service (pp. 3077-8). Rep. Hoffman, Mich., criticized AAA (p. 3078). Reps. Rolph, Calif., and Tarver discussed the anti-assessment amendment (pp. 3078-9). Rep. White, Idaho, discussed the market news service (p. 3079). Reps. Cochran, Mo., and Tarver discussed the provision permitting REA to employ Latin American engineers (pp. 3079-80).

2. A.A.A.; TOBACCO. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H.J.Res. 234, providing that the Burley tobacco acreage allotments under the 1938 AAAct shall not be less than one acre or 25% of the crop land for any farm having had 1943 allotment, that this acreage shall be in addition to the present acreage allotments, and that tobacco marketing quotas shall be extended until the 1946-47 marketing

year (pp. 3084-5). The Senate had passed the proposal earlier in the day with an amendment extending quotas for 2 years (pp. 3096-7). This measure will now be sent to the President.

3. TRANSPORTATION. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 3261, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 tons or less (p. 3084).

4. FLOOD CONTROL. Received the War Department's flood-control survey report on the Kern River (Calif.). To Flood Control Committee. (p. 3088).

5. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 27 (pp. 3087, 3088).

SENATE

6. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed with amendments this bill, H.R. 4070 (pp. 3097-118, 3119-35).

Agreed to the following amendments:

Committee amendments (revised and modified) relating to the method of financing TVA operations, etc. (pp. 3097-118).

Committee amendment providing penalties for nonofficial use of Government vehicles and requiring such vehicles to be marked (p. 3119).

Committee amendment to make appointments at $4,500 or more subject to Senate confirmation (p. 3119). Later Sen. Burton, Ohio, moved to reconsider the vote, and a motion by Sen. McKellar, Tenn., to lay Sen. Burton's motion on the table was agreed to 31-23 (p. 3130).

Committee amendment to prohibit use of appropriations to finance executive-order agencies which have been in existence for a year or more and for which Congress has not specifically appropriated funds (pp. 3119-26). Agreed to an amendment to the amendment, by Sen. Ball, Minn., to provide that the amendment shall not take effect until July 1, 1944 (pp. 3119-20). Sen. Butler, Nebr., submitted an amendment to the amendment, prohibiting allotment or assignment of funds to other agencies without authorization in the applicable appropriation act, but after discussion, Sen. Butler withdrew the amendment (p. 3120). Agreed, 37-21, to an amendment to the amendment, by Sen. Buck, Del., exempting the Fair Employment Practice Committee from the committee amendment (pp. 3120-2). Subsequently the Buck amendment was reconsidered and was rejected 27-33).

By Sen. McKellar, Tenn., to provide for an Acting Comptroller General in the absence of the C. G. and the Assistant C. G. (pp. 3129-30).

By Sen. Gayden, Ariz., to limit to $172,410 the amount which may be used for the Wool Products Labeling Act (p. 3130).

Rejected an amendment by Sen. Aiken, Vt., to provide for a GAO audit of the financial transactions of Government corporations (differing somewhat from the recent CCC provision). Although the vote was 34-19, the amendment was defeated because a two-thirds vote was required. (pp. 3132-35).

Sens. Glass, Russell, Truman, Green, McKellar, Bridges, and White were appointed Senate conferees (p. 3135).

7. VETERANS; REHABILITATION; FARM LOANS. Passed, 50-0, with amendments S. 1767, providing for Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning veterans from World War 2, including a provision for loans to veterans for the purchase of farms and equipment (pp. 3135-47). Agreed to the following committee amendments: (1) to include the Secretary of Agriculture on an advisory council to the Veterans' Administrator with respect to educational provisions for veterans and (2) to permit loans for repairing, altering, or improving farm buildings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address recently delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] in his home State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter addressed to Hon. Thomas F. MacDonald, which is signed by a group of Congressmen from the States of Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, relating to the construction of an air-line highway from Memphis, Tenn., to Houston, Tex. A copy of this letter was likewise sent to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], chairman of the House Committee on Roads. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include this letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an Associated Press dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of tax simplification.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including therein an article entitled "The Indian in the United States."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILCHRIST addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, after the address by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Harness amendment which was adopted by the House yesterday, in printing the amendment in the RECORD, the word "of" is substituted for the word "for," which appeared in the amendment that was presented to the Clerk. I have checked that with the original amendment which was presented, and I ask unanimous consent that on page 3035 of the RECORD, the language shall read in accordance with the provision of the amendment as it was presented to the Clerk's desk, so that it will read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 65, line 18, after the end of the bracket, strike out the period and insert: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Andresen, August H.	Gamble	Myers
Auchincloss	Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, Md.	Goodwin	O'Connor
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gross	O'Konski
Barrett	Hale	O'Toole
Barry	Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeifer
Blackney	Harless, Ariz.	Philbin
Bonner	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Plumley
Brooks	Heffernan	Poulson
Brumbaugh	Herter	Pracht, C. Frederick
Buckley	Holmes, Mass.	Pratt, Joseph M.
Bulwinkle	Holmes, Wash.	Price
Burchill, N. Y.	Izac	Rabaut
Busbey	Jeffrey	Randolph
Butler	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rankin
Byrne	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Capozzoli	Kee	Sabath
Celler	Kelley	Sadowski
Chenoweth	Kennedy	Satterfield
Coffee	Kilburn	Scanlon
Compton	Klein	Scott
Dewey	LaFollette	Shafer
Dickstein	Lambertson	Sheridan
Dies	Lane	Short
Dingell	LeFevre	Sikes
Disney	Luce	Snyder
Domengeaux	Lynch	Stanley
Doughton	McCormack	Sumner, Ill.
Douglas	McCowen	Sundstrom
Ellison, Md.	McGehee	Taylor
Ellsworth	McWilliams	Thomas, N. J.
Elmer	Maas	Torrens
Engel, Mich.	Manasco	Treadway
Fay	May	Vorys, Ohio
Feighan	Merritt	Vursell
Fernandez	Merrow	Ward
Fogarty	Miller, Mo.	Weichel, Ohio
Fuller	Miller, Nebr.	Weiss
Fulmer	Monroney	Winter
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	Wright
Gallagher		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 298 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with Greek Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by William Green, American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the 21st of March.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I have received from a soldier overseas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: On page 64, line 25, after the word "producers", strike out the colon, add a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the membership of the House to read this proviso which, in my opinion, is the most vicious limitation I have ever seen placed on an appropriation bill. If we are justified in placing this limitation in the pending appropriation bill you will likewise be justified in placing it in every appropriation bill. This not only applies to the A. A. A. but it applies to every employee and every official of the Department of Agriculture from the Secretary down. The proviso deprives every employee and official of the Department the right of petition. They would even be prohibited from discussing matters with you unless you called upon them to do so.

Mr. Chairman, as far as political activity is concerned, we already have a law on the statute books that takes care of the situation; however, this goes further, for under the provisions of this limitation no official or employee of the Department could voluntarily contribute to any campaign, be it national or local. In my opinion, it would be a violation of the limitation if an official or an employee attended a Jackson Day or Lincoln Day dinner where they were required to pay for the dinner, part of which went to a political committee. I understand this grows out of some kind of a fight out in the field between certain groups of employees of the Department of Agriculture. This situation could be corrected without placing language of this character in the bill. I also understand certain employees have opposed Members of Congress. You can stop that under existing law.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that when we deny the right of petition to an individual, be he private citizen or Government employee, we are in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. Right of petition is something we have always tried to protect. As far as I am personally concerned I have no employees, or at least not more than 5 or 10, of the Department of Agriculture who live in my district. Most of them are meat inspectors. I am speaking from the standpoint of principle. The language is so broad that it is going to absolutely require employees and officials to refrain from any kind of activity in connection with any matters relating to the Department. As I said before, if you set a precedent by placing this language in the pending billl, then you would be justified in placing it in every appropriation bill. I would like to have some of the members of this subcommittee who are responsible for the language explain to the House why they think it is justified, especially when we have a law, the Hatch Act, now on the statute books.

Let me also ask what the Comptroller General will do. Will it be necessary to have an affidavit from every employee monthly showing the law has not been violated before he can pay them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending amendment be limited to 15 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be allotted to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], which would strike the last proviso of the bill and which in so doing would also strike out the Harness amendment which was adopted yesterday, will be defeated.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not possible to reoffer the Harness amendment by itself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am speaking of what would happen if the gentleman's amendment is adopted. I am not passing on subsequent procedure or parliamentary considerations that may develop. I think the gentleman from Missouri will agree that if his amendment is adopted the Harness amendment goes with it.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing wrong with this language in the bill. It applies first of all to full-time employees of the Department of Agriculture only who engage in political or lobby activities. Why should they receive the largess of the taxpayers of this country or receive funds out of the Federal Treasury, and at the same time be permitted to engage in lobby activities to subserve the purposes that must be paid for out of the Federal Treasury? There is one of those paradoxes in itself and should have been effectively cured long ago. We anticipated that the Hatch Act would cure it, but evidently it has not because there have been some of these activities in the field in the last year or two, and this is notably true in connection with lobby activities for larger funds for agriculture out of the Federal Treasury, for incentive payments.

We had the investigators go into these activities last year to examine a good many of the telegrams that had been sent by the officials of the Department in Washington. I have that whole file of photostats in my office at the present time. When the matter of incentive payments was up, wires went out from certain officials in the Department to people in the field who had an interest in the matter and at the bottom of the wire was the statement, "Wire your Senators and Congressmen." Oddly enough, it was scratched from the photostat copies in the file. That simply gives point then to the fact that the greatest, sometimes the most insidious, and certainly the most influential lobby activities in the Government are not pressure groups on the outside of the Government, but pressure groups on the inside who consist of those who are on the pay roll. We wanted to be very clear that this interdiction is meant to stop that kind of activity and that kind of pressure upon the National Legislature.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the expression "full-time employee" would cover a local member of the A. A. A. committee in any county?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The community committeeman, for instance, will receive forty or fifty dollars a year. The county committeeman will receive something like $500 a year on the average, and that group are not full-time employees in the Department, so there is an exception for them, since this applies only to full-time employees.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman tell us whether the A. A. A.

here in Washington has construed this limitation as affecting the local county committees?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have had no expression from the A. A. A., simply because the subcommittee has not asked them. The language in itself is sufficiently clear, in my judgment.

Mr. COLE of New York. For the gentleman's information, last fall I received a communication from a member of the A. A. A. committee in one of my counties criticizing the subsidy program. Within a month that entire committee was summarily dismissed by the headquarters of the A. A. A. here in Washington for violation of this particular section.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I think the language is explicit, it is clear, it is effective. It goes only to full-time employees. It goes to political activities that are designed to bring about the defeat or election of a person in public office simply because he takes one position or another on questions of agricultural policy or funds in which a Federal employee would have a personal interest. That is scarcely healthy.

It is time that a provision of this kind be inserted in the bill as a refresher to people who have forgotten the Hatch Act. They have forgotten also the antilobby statute that was adopted shortly after the First World War when there was so much pressure to obtain or maintain large appropriations for given groups in the country that Congress by way of defense of itself and its activities had to adopt the antilobby statute. People have forgotten. It ought to be reaffirmed from time to time to make sure we will not be overwhelmed by these lobby activities.

I trust, therefore, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] will be roundly defeated.

[Mr. CANNON of Missouri addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 62, line 5, after the colon following the word "inclusive", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no payment or payments hereunder to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of $500: *And provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding the amount to which he would otherwise be entitled."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because of the inclusion of the second proviso therein, which, in my judgment, constitutes legislation upon an appropriation bill. It is in effect a construction of the preceding proviso, and which legislatively provides that the preceding proviso in the case of tenants shall not be taken at its face value but that a different rule shall be applicable to them. Because that provision is included, I think the entire amendment is subject to a point of order because of its being legislative in character.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Kansas on the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia with respect to the second proviso of the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. First, I believe the point of order comes too late. I had been recognized by the Chair. I think I am correct in that.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman had commenced debate.

Mr. TARVER. No, indeed. I got the attention of the Chair just as soon as I could after hearing the amendment read. Of course, I could not make a point of order until I heard the amendment read and determined whether I thought it was subject to a point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I will not press that point.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment identical with the one now before the Committee was presented in this House on April 17, 1943. There was a considerable amount of discussion with regard to it. A point of order was raised against it. We had exactly the same situation we have now. The gentleman from Georgia, I believe, raised the point of order. I believe I am correct in that.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In any event a point of order was raised against it by a member of the committee. We had the same chairman at that time that we have now. I assume that under the same circumstances there should be no necessity of going back and presenting the matter again. The whole matter with respect to the question of whether a point of order would lie against the amendment was presented on that occasion.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I think he is mistaken. I did not make the point of order which may have been urged a year ago. I think the point of order was not raised on the ground I have submitted here, as an objection to the pending amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not have the RECORD before me, but the matter was pretty thoroughly discussed at that time. It may have been on a similar amendment presented earlier in the day. I do not believe the amendment in its present form is subject to a point of order. I am going to leave it to the decision of the Chair, but I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that an amendment was offered on April 17, 1943, and the Chair ruled that a point of order would lie against it. The gentleman from Kansas then submitted another amendment, identical with the one pending before the committee, and that amendment was accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. As the gentleman from Kansas said, after a point of order had been made and sustained for another purpose against the amendment, he did submit the amendment, as disclosed by the RECORD of April 17, 1943, in the form that he now submits it, but no point of order was made against it at that time.

The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Georgia on the proposition of whether or not the second proviso would constitute an exception to the limitation contained in the first part of the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. No, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion, having heard the amendment read, although I have not had the opportunity to examine it carefully, that the second proviso does not constitute merely an exception to the limitation made in the first proviso, but it is legislative in character and constitutes a legislative construction of the language contained in the first proviso and is, therefore, clearly in itself legislation. I know no reason why the gentleman from Kansas should not offer or be permitted to offer the first proviso. But I think the second proviso which reads, "*And provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding the amount to which he would otherwise be entitled," is clearly a legislative construction of the preceding proviso and, therefore, in itself constitutes legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Just one point. Let me observe that the so-called limitation is a limitation only on the first proviso of the amendment and does not constitute legislation on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the second proviso constitutes an exception to the provisions of the amendment as contained in the first proviso. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical with one I submitted and was adopted by the House last year. It went to another body and was eliminated by the members of the conference committee. The amendment simply limits the payment under this program to any one person, firm, or corporation to a maximum of $500. Share renters also participate up to $500.

Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable misunderstanding with regard to what is known as the soil-conservation program in the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service has its own organization and has been in effect for many years. We appropriate approximately $30,000,000 per year for it. That agency employes hundreds of soil experts, and other trained men to render assistance with respect to soil conditions, crops, conservation, crop rotation, and any and all kinds of advice and information is furnished free to the farmers. This agency, although not so much publicized, has done a great amount of real constructive work.

This section of the legislation deals with payments that are allowed by the Government for following certain land programs and practices laid out by the

Agricultural Adjustment Agency. These payments are, as the legislation suggests, in compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1936 as amended in 1938. Now, Mr. Chairman, all I am asking is that since this money paid by taxpayers, from the Federal Treasury, that payments be limited to $500.

This item provides for an expenditure of a total of $300,000,000. That is, there is $290,000,000 in this section and then a carry-over of $10,000,000. Of the total amount you propose to spend $24,250,000 for salaries and expenses of those who administer this part of the act.

Now, take a look as to how this money from the Treasury is divided—I have only the approximate figures for 1943. They are practically in line with those of 1942. Here is the way the funds are distributed. There are approximately 6,000,000 farmers participating. Last year there were 5,860,000. Two-fifths of these farmers, or 1,815,000, got less than $20 each. Three million two hundred and sixty thousand, or more than 60 percent, did not get as much as $40 each. Four million nine hundred and seventy-five thousand, or 83 percent, of these farmers did not get as much as $100, and 95 percent got less than $200 each. As a matter of fact it took less than 20 percent of the money to pay more than half of the farmers. Then about $60,000,000 was sliced off to a few big operators. It seems to me that if the Government wants to assist farmers by paying money direct for following certain rules to build up the soil, good and well, but I feel there should be a limit in favor of the individual who looks after his land, whether he owns it or not. Seems to me that since this program does not provide for "laying out" any land, and since none is to be used for incentive payments, this House might see fit to save approximately $60,000,000 for the taxpayers of this country and at the same time not disturb any farmer unless, of course, some landowners should feel they are entitled to the extra cash, although the money paid up to $500 is credited on work that improves his investment and his estate. Let me say again, you are not taking anything away from anyone. You are limiting the amount paid by your Government to anyone. The limit affects only about 2 or 3 percent, but it saves $60,000,000.

It seems rather strange that since this Government started out to assist the farmers when prices were low and crops poor that the big operators justify a demand at this time of payments from this fund in sums of thousands of dollars. I ask you to take a look at the figures and tables inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable REID MURRAY, showing to whom these payments were made in sums of thousands of dollars each, and then look at the 3,000,000 farmers who did not even get as much as $20. And yet you will say it is very inequitable to place a limit on these payments. Does it occur to you that this is Government money and not proceeds from the land?

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot think the operators of large tracts of land would want to withhold payments from their tenants just because their own payments for soil conservation on their own land is limited to $500. Incidently, this Congress not so long ago just could not stand to see operators get payments ranging from $25,000 to $100,000 and more, so Congress did attempt to fix a limit of $10,000, subject to certain modifications.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct your attention to the fact that we have in this bill the present agency dealing with the subject Conservation and Use of Agricultural Resources. It provides for the expenditure of $24,250,000 to pay employees and agents in Washington and in every State and every county in the United States. Offices, equipment, and automobiles with gasoline and tires are furnished. I do not know the number of employees, but there are thousands of them. These individuals, according to the legislation, are concerned with "conservation and use of agricultural land resources."

Then, Mr. Chairman, right in this same agricultural bill, and on the next page of the bill, another and separate division is entitled "Soil Conservation Service."

This provides for expenditure of $29,637,248 to be used for salaries and expenses for soil-research investigations. To study soil character, cause, history, depletion, and so forth. It also provides for maintaining offices here in Washington, also in every State in the Union, also in districts and counties within the States.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot understand why the Soil Conservation Service is not permitted and required to administer both of these agencies. Here are two agencies right in the Department of Agriculture dealing with the same subject matter, one costs about $25,000,000 for personal services and expenses, and the other costs approximately the same amount. Fifty million dollars for services that could be reduced as much as $20,000,000 I am sure, and not injure the farmer or the country in doing so. You might have to trim a little extra on personnel, but I do not think it would injure the services rendered to the farmer. There would also be a saving of manpower that is so much needed right now.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country have all they possibly can do to meet the requirements and demands of their Government. They are doing a magnificent job. They are willing to work from dawn to dark. They and their wives and children are doing everything possible to meet their goals in producing food for the armed forces and for civilian requirements. They are doing it in spite of a lot of handicaps, shortage of help, and adequate machinery and equipment, but, Mr. Chairman, with all this the farmer ought to be given a little more encouragement and more consideration. He is doing a war job. Let him have a little more machinery, more fertilizer. More necessary gas for farming, and, above all things, cut out a lot of red tape, rules and regulations that are imposed on him and are retarding his efforts. Give the farmer a little more "green light" for a change.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that discussion on this amendment be concluded in 45 minutes, the last 10 minutes of which may be for the use of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to help to keep the New Deal from committing agricultural suicide. That is not the reason I am supporting the amendment. I am supporting the amendment because the amendment is right. Last year there were $400,000,000 for soil conservation. This year there is $390,000,000, plus $10,000,000 carry-over, or $400,000,000. A $375 ceiling this year, which would be the same as $500 passed last year when the Rees amendment was passed.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will yield only for a correction.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question. The money will be distributed differently this year than it was last year in that it will be paid only for crops, whereas last year it was paid for other things than crops; is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct, as he always is, but it is doubtful if it will disturb the relationship between the small payments and the big payments.

Do you wish to be in the position of supporting a program whereby in 1942 nearly a third of the cooperators received $20 or less, and 33,000 cooperators received $58,000,000?

Do you wish to provide $58,000,000 for one group of 33,000 when another agency right in the same United States Department of Agriculture is asking 840,000 United States farmers who have mortgages on their farms to pay in $12,000,000 more to the United States Treasury in the form of increased interest rates? They need more money. They are going to raise the interest rates on July 1 on 840,000 United States farmers who have mortgages on their farms. At the same time they are going to carry on a program of distributing $58,000,000 to 33,000 large operators in the country. You are asked to support a program where 370 large operators in Georgia, for example, receive over $300,000, and where 94,000 cooperators in 1942 received $20 or less.

Or, take the State of Texas, where 178,000 farmers received $20 or less, and still we have 3,300 large operators receiving $4,941,000. It does not make any difference what State you take. It all works out the same.

In Wisconsin we have 22,000 farmers getting less than $20.

The same United States Department of Agriculture through another agency, says we have to have $600,000 more from the people of our State of Wisconsin as a

result of increased interest rates on farm loans. The same agency in the United States Department of Agriculture says we need $12,000,000 more interest from the 840,000 farm mortgages they hold in the United States.

In Kansas where our colleague the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE comes from, 3,000 cooperators received $3,000,000; yet there are 32,000 other operators who received $20 or less. These 32,000 operators received a total of less than $640,000; and yet 3,000 big operators got $3,000,000.

This is purely legislation for the few at the expense of the many. You can subscribe to such a program but it does not coincide with my convictions.

I will give you other States.

In Massachusetts we have 4,500 farmers who received $20 or less per cooperator. We have 8 big cooperators who received over $2,000 each.

In New York, 18 large cooperators received $7,000; and 5,900 cooperators in New York State received $20 or less.

Illinois—here is a combination that we have to beat on the floor—our distinguished colleague from Illinois, our good friend and my candidate for President [Mr. DIRKSEN], aided by the gentleman from Kansas, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, and our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON. When you have to go up against them, together with the gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable FRED GILCHRIST, you have a hard row to hoe. I know that. However, take Illinois: 24,000 small operators received $20 or less; but 4,400 of the larger cooperators in the same State received $2,800,000, to say nothing about the $4,000,000 that they threw in as parity payments, which they did not have the conscience to put into the bill this year.

The following official table that I am reading from gives you each State in detail as to the amounts of payments:

TABLE No. 12.—*Estimated number of payees receiving payments in various size-of-payment groups, by States, 1942 agricultural conservation program*

Number of pagees

State and region	$0 to $20	$20.01 to $40	$40.01 to $60	$60.01 to $100	$100.01 to $150	$150.01 to $200	$200.01 to $300	$300.01 to $400	$400.01 to $500	$500.01 to $1,000	$1,000.01 to $2,000	$2,000.01 to $3,000	$3,000.01 to $4,000	$4,000.01 to $5,000	$5,000.01 to $10,000	Total number of payees
Maine	5,380	7,149	2,739	2,493	1,373	707	416	159	54	86	29	7	2	1	2	20,597
New Hampshire	1,842	5,173	1,415	1,049	300	70	32	3	4	2						9,890
Vermont	2,758	5,622	3,760	3,021	822	169	56	13	3	5						16,229
Massachusetts	4,582	7,229	2,602	2,198	966	288	145	20	7	6	6					18,049
Rhode Island	159	1,169	200	131	47	17	8			7						1,738
Connecticut	1,840	5,124	1,651	1,426	528	195	93	28	13	32	7	4	1		1	10,943
New York	5,968	25,258	19,870	23,780	8,643	2,289	716	204	56	88	9	4	1			86,886
New Jersey	2,396	2,911	2,040	2,972	1,570	726	382	140	63	80	10	1		1	1	13,293
Pennsylvania	26,777	32,195	20,682	19,455	6,142	1,198	520	135	24	25	44	16	6		3	107,222
Northeast	51,702	91,830	54,959	56,525	20,391	5,659	2,368	702	224	331	105	32	10	2	7	284,847
Illinois	24,916	24,899	23,039	41,602	36,177	21,585	14,891	5,009	2,118	1,854	302	29	12	1	1	196,435
Indiana	27,587	29,694	24,271	34,797	20,550	9,707	5,639	1,693	669	576	78	9	5	4		155,279
Iowa	11,374	14,811	20,446	49,104	45,177	30,703	19,405	5,773	1,988	1,489	119	11	4	2	2	200,408
Michigan	37,967	40,702	27,697	26,570	8,741	2,376	814	177	56	33	8					145,141
Minnesota	35,740	32,940	23,234	34,541	23,580	11,658	5,912	1,494	460	396	69	9	2		2	170,037
Missouri	45,542	50,447	32,646	38,527	20,071	9,190	5,359	1,882	750	905	182	36	8	3	4	205,552
Nebraska	15,580	21,707	19,820	33,313	25,959	15,712	10,169	2,953	1,157	1,243	198	17	9	2	2	147,841
Ohio	38,179	37,727	33,816	43,559	22,339	9,312	4,687	1,319	452	420	62	7	1	1	2	191,883
South Dakota	21,823	11,100	9,022	15,753	12,698	8,635	6,284	2,540	1,188	1,358	224	27	6	2		90,660
Wisconsin	22,033	45,413	42,485	43,874	13,035	3,609	1,254	219	60	54	13					172,049
North Central	280,741	309,440	256,476	361,640	228,327	122,487	74,414	23,059	8,898	8,328	1,255	145	47	15	13	1,675,285
Delaware	2,000	3,214	1,800	1,601	590	185	55	15	4	5	1					9,470
Maryland	6,520	8,104	5,250	5,010	1,922	655	240	60	28	30	6	1				27,826
Virginia	64,847	37,418	14,127	9,642	3,306	1,274	498	171	94	106	8	3	3	1	1	131,499
West Virginia	25,570	21,503	4,882	2,643	725	233	83	27	22	20	3					55,711
North Carolina	145,780	120,563	54,115	33,600	7,900	2,575	1,270	492	210	300	64	12	6	3	3	366,893
Kentucky	99,159	62,883	25,740	24,800	8,075	3,520	1,595	590	250	260	36	7	2			226,917
Tennessee	136,080	72,700	24,100	21,302	6,318	2,140	1,031	430	198	214	46	5				264,564
East Central	479,956	326,385	130,014	98,598	28,836	10,582	4,772	1,785	806	935	164	28	11	4	4	1,082,880
Alabama	119,304	65,873	30,259	20,920	5,496	1,609	931	277	134	160	29	4			4	245,000
Arkansas	94,480	73,846	35,212	26,653	9,546	3,369	1,826	828	374	1,195	560	152	74	32	34	248,181
Florida	23,154	13,364	5,134	3,654	1,540	670	395	221	129	114	68	25	10	7	8	48,493
Georgia	94,993	71,735	32,249	24,203	7,218	2,408	1,080	474	253	322	36	10	14		5	235,000
Louisiana	74,377	56,891	22,746	12,489	3,464	1,499	773	319	222	367	115	21	2	6	8	173,299
Mississippi	113,838	113,184	44,325	27,165	8,092	3,123	1,956	872	625	1,102	621	167	83	35	19	315,207
Oklahoma	101,435	44,699	25,918	32,105	17,295	7,780	3,959	1,253	494	300	82					235,320
South Carolina	45,614	50,577	27,220	21,998	7,913	3,233	1,906	773	502	663	159	20	6	3	2	160,589
Texas	178,148	105,512	67,936	76,204	45,309	26,668	17,444	7,142	3,379	4,277	1,125	280	48	26	22	533,520
Southern	845,343	595,681	290,999	245,391	105,873	50,359	30,270	12,159	6,112	8,500	2,795	679	237	109	102	2,194,609
Arizona	647	652	386	621	513	394	372	264	170	358	226	80	26	21	25	4,755
California	29,252	21,313	10,096	9,923	5,005	3,193	2,589	1,294	863	1,553	777	173	100	59	99	86,289
Colorado	9,887	7,556	5,382	6,647	4,564	2,819	2,454	1,116	570	765	166	20	7	2	4	41,959
Idaho	4,738	6,251	5,143	7,165	4,341	2,534	1,876	806	525	699	140	15	4	1	2	34,240
Kansas	32,728	33,493	23,848	32,372	22,690	12,279	13,172	5,396	2,935	3,700	659	109	36	18	18	183,453
Montana	11,184	6,687	4,123	5,385	3,906	3,305	3,405	2,100	1,214	2,069	427	47	9	1	12	43,874
Nevada	408	414	259	265	188	101	69	23	13	21	10	3	1	1		1,776
New Mexico	8,358	3,341	1,752	2,511	1,946	1,659	1,090	538	312	530	164	43	14	5	10	22,273
North Dakota	31,319	16,025	11,084	14,342	11,668	7,848	8,057	4,733	1,946	2,078	188	19	6	2		109,315
Oregon	8,943	7,685	3,775	3,848	1,938	1,192	863	452	300	612	288	57	12	7	5	29,977
Utah	7,511	5,375	2,613	2,182	900	488	344	150	96	130	50	7	1	1		19,848
Washington	10,135	9,899	3,830	3,458	1,778	1,282	1,211	805	448	981	414	57	17	4	3	34,322
Wyoming	2,281	1,887	1,350	1,767	1,179	888	754	341	207	342	109	26	7	3	2	11,143
Western	157,391	120,578	73,641	90,486	60,616	37,982	36,256	18,018	9,599	13,838	3,618	656	240	125	180	623,224
Total	1,815,133	1,443,914	806,089	852,640	444,043	227,069	148,080	55,723	25,639	31,932	7,937	1,540	545	255	306	[1] 5,860,845

[1] Does not include 2,928 payees for naval stores and 98,592 payees in insular region.

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Division of Special Programs, September 1943.

You will note that 1,815,000, or about one-third of the total number, received $20 or less as conservation payments. You will note that 3,259,069 cooperators, or about three-fifths of the cooperators, received less than $40 each. You will note that 4,917,818 cooperators of total of 5,860,845 cooperators received less than $100 each. You will note that 95 percent of the cooperators received less than $200 each. Would it be such a legislative sin to put a $500 ceiling on future payments?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am assailed with deep agitation of soul after these gracious avowals of my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] that I must be in opposition to his position

and to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. The thesis which they have belabored here indicates that they mistake the concept of soil conservation and the husbanding of our agricultural land resources. They insist upon putting it on a personal basis. They discuss payments to farmers. That is not the purpose of this program. This program is to conserve the great national asset of our soil. This program deals with acres, not with individuals. This program deals with fertility and the conserving of that fertility.

I might best express it in the terms of the poem which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] gave us the other day, by this young man, who in the heat of battle said, "My friends, what have you done today?"

This program challenges the farmers of the country and says to them, "What have you done to conserve your soil today?" Then we say to them, "If you do a prescribed thing, we shall reimburse you for your effort. If you plant clover, if you plant vetch, if you put lime or superphosphate upon your soil we shall reimburse you, not as an individual, but for what you have done to conserve the soil of the country."

I am glad we have finally gotten bottomed up on this program. It was once shot through with acreage adjustment and other purposes, so that for raising less or raising more, we paid people out of the Federal Treasury. All of that is gone, at least, momentarily. We have put an interdiction in this bill that there shall be no funds for incentive payments. We have required that this program be approved by the State A. A. A. to make sure that the practices will conform to their knowledge of the soil in that State. We are seeking for the maximum benefit. for a national, natural asset. It is therefore not a question of whether he is a small farmer or a large farmer, or whether he is a personal or a corporate entity, but whether or not, as a person, or as a corporate entity something has been done for the hundreds of millions of acres of land that we would conserve, because we realize so well what has befallen so many other countries, notably China, with all of its weak soil, made so because soil conservation was never practiced in the days when that rich alluvial topsoil was being washed away by many of the small streams.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Why is it that we have two separate organizations here? You have in one part of this bill an appropriation of something like $30,000,000 for the Soil Conservation Service rendered by the Government of the United States, whereby they assist the farmers, furnish technical advice, and help them to protect their soil as the gentleman suggests—a very fine, splendid program. Why is it then, that you do not emphasize that program and make it more important, rather than to go out here and offer these little payments to individuals for building fences across their pastures, for instance, or fixing terraces or for mowing weeds and things like that, and being paid for out of the Federal Treasury? If the Government is going to pay for these things, then why not put it on that basis?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer is twofold. First, as to building up Soil Conservation Service, which is a service agency, we have increased the appropriation in this bill, because we recognize its value. Its function is threefold. The first is to conduct researches in the field of moisture and soil practices, the types of plants and grasses that do best in enriching and conserving soil of different kinds in different areas. Third, to carry on practical demonstration field operations where the farmers can go and see the practical value and then be able to do it for themselves. Now, the farmer can do for himself under the pending program; but do not forget he could probably make more money by planting some kind of a crop that is a cash crop but which we do not need in quantity. So, here is an incentive for conserving the national asset, the great resource of soil.

I trust the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nothing new to this body. I have been a Member of this House for almost 6 years. Every year with the exception of one, that being 1941, an amendment similar to this has been offered to the agriculture appropriation measure when it came to the floor of the House. Every time such an amendment has been presented it has failed to be enacted into law. There are many reasons why this amendment should not be adopted: First, it is unsound and unjustifiable; second, it has no place in a sound soil-conservation program as I see it; and, third, it never has been presented to the Committee on Agriculture for hearings and consideration by that committee.

When this program was first inaugurated there was no limitation whatever on these payments. About 7 or 8 years ago the Committee on Agriculture held hearings and determined that a limitation of $10,000 was justified and should be written into the law, and that was done. Then in 1939 the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable Marvin Jones, presented the bill H. R. 3800 which put a limitation of $5,000 on these payments and carried a provision with respect to keeping share croppers on the forms. That bill passed this House. Since that time the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] offered an amendment cutting down these payments to $1,000; and since 1942, I believe, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has offered his amendment to reduce these payments to the farmers to $500. I do not see any reason why if we are going to have a soil-conservation program the same treatment should apply to every type of farmer whether he has 200 acres, 50 acres, or 1,000 acres. There should be no discrimination because a man has worked hard and saved his money and increased the size of his holdings. That is the American way.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making. Likewise at this point I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for the very logical and informative statement he made to this House. We no longer have any parity payments. This is a matter of paying men to take care of their soil.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is just as important to take care of a 10,000-acre farm as a 10-acre farm. When you start to discriminate you destroy the soil conservation program, yet we all know that our soil is the greatest asset this Nation has.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. Not at this point. I hope the gentleman will let me proceed just a little further.

Along that very line, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that these large farms are nothing in the world but the aggregation of several small farms. You are not going to have a soil-conservation program unless the large farmer signs and enters this program. When he does go in he carries with him his tenants and sharecroppers, and the only way they are going to get in is for the landlord to sign up for this program and by his doing so he carries with him his tenants and sharecropper who work from 20 to 40 acres of land in accordance with the size of their families.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Arkansas has fought for several years to keep the soil-conservation program intact. The statement that the gentleman has made in regard to the tenants not being able to join in unless the landlord goes in is the hub of the entire matter. If we accept the amendment offered by my good friend from Kansas, we take away from the tenant farmer the privilege of joining in this program.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct; if the landlord does not go in the tenant cannot. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who as a farmer himself has consistently supported the triple A program and for whose views I have the highest respect. It could just as well be argued that a manufacturer is not entitled to a tariff of more than $500. That is what you are saying by this amendment in principle. You may just as logically say that because a day laborer only earns $3 a day, every person, whoever he may be, and whatever his duties, cannot receive more than $3 a day. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas will be defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend some of the large farm owners in my district, the insurance companies. I know it is very popular to attack Wall Street and to attack huge financial institutions, but in considering the effect of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] on insurance companies we must think of these same insurance companies simply as temporary owners of a large number of farms. I have not discussed this with a single representative of any insurance company. I am sure that the insurance companies referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] would much rather not own the farms they now own but, owning them and being expected to carry on this soil conservation program, they have the right to expect that there will be no discrimination against a company because it owns a thousand farms instead of one.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that this soil conservation program is a compliance program to build up the fertility of the soil of this country and that the man is only compensated when he complies and does the things that are necessary to build up the fertility of the soil? That leaves it an acreage proposition; and what difference does it make if a man spends the money to build up the fertility of the soil on a thousand acres? That is not going to make bigger payments to the fellow that is working only a 10-acre farm; his payments were not to be increased, as I see it, under that program.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Of course I will not. I cannot yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot yield at this time. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] asked this question, Do you want to support a program that pays huge sums to 5 percent of the farmers and a much smaller sum to the remaining 95 percent of our farmers? I shall answer that question by saying, in all frankness, and I think I can speak for the insurance companies that own so many of these farms that they would favor legislation to eliminate this whole farm program, soil conservation, parity payments, and so forth. They would eliminate the paying of money to a farmer to reduce his crops 1 year and then pay the same farmer the next year for increasing his crops. I believe that the executives of the American insurance companies, like any other citizens, look forward to the day when there will not be any Government agents tramping across the farms of American farmers; when he will be able to raise his crops and get a reasonable price in the market place that will pay him for raising them. However, as long as soil-conservation payments are going to be made on an acreage basis and officials of the Federal Government feel it is necessary to pay farmers for conserving the soil then the benefits must, of necessity, be made as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] so clearly stated, on the basis of acreage owned. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to assure my colleague from Connecticut that I do not hold anything against the insurance companies. I have several policies in some of the insurance companies, but that does not change the picture. Let me call attention to this: If this is such a wonderful soil-conservation program no man who knows anything about the soil can stand there and say that the soil has been conserved as well today as it was 5 years ago, 10 years ago, or a hundred years ago.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Now, if I may interrupt the gentleman at that point, I am not discussing the merits of the soil-conservation program, I am discussing the cash benefits. If they are going to make payments to John Smith who has 10 acres on the basis of the work he does on those 10 acres, then it must be paid on the same basis to any company which may have even 10,000 acres on the same basis. The insurance company is only the trustee of their policyholders' funds. They are holding these farms against the time when they can dispose of them for the benefit of their policyholders, not for the benefit of their stockholders. Take the case particularly of a mutual company, they certainly are acting only for the benefit of their policyholders, they have no stockholders. They would be remiss in their duty to their policyholders if they did not make application for the soil-conservation payments that are available to them on the basis of what they have done for the land they temporarily hold.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not in accord with the Reece amendment. I think in its nature it is a socialistic idea. We might as well limit the amount of crops you can raise or the amount of land you can own and the taxes you can pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out already that this is a different program than the one to which this amendment has been offered in previous years, for the reason that this is simply a soil conservation program and payments can be made only upon the performance of certain practices. The soil conservation program is either right or it is wrong. It is either right to make these payments for these practices or it is wrong. If it is not right, and the gentleman from Kansas, my distinguished colleague, and my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, say it is not right, then their motion should be to strike out the provision altogether. Let us not make these payments to any farmer, large or small, if it is the wrong thing to do. But if soil conservation is a proper practice and if we are improving the soil of this country by carrying out those practices, then what difference does it make whether a large landowner having a number of tenants and large acreage in crops on his farm receives as much money as a half dozen individual farmers operating the same acreage would receive?

There is no consistency at all in the position of the gentlemen who are saying that we should put a limit upon the amount of payments that may be made to any individual landowner. If this is just to be construed as a gratuity to be paid to farmers because they are farmers, and to be paid only to small farmers, then why do we have these provisions in here requiring that they perform any practices at all? Let us cut out the red tape, let us cut out the administrative cost, and just say that every farmer farming less than so many acres of land will get a payment out of the Federal Treasury. That is the logical way to proceed if the theory of the gentleman from Kansas is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman express himself on a concern which I have over the amendment offered by the gentleman's colleague from Kansas, to this effect: I am afraid that the restrictive operations of this amendment would operate against the tenants more than against the insurance company. Is it not true that under this amendment a tenant would almost be barred from cooperating, even if he might want to, because the insurance company would put something in the lease to the effect that he could not cooperate inasmuch as we cannot collect our share.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that undoubtedly would be the effect in many cases.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If this is a soil-conservation program, I would like to know if the gentleman does not think that someone might ask why it is necessary to unload the money pretty much in the sections that have the best land in the country—including, I would like to mention to my colleague from Kansas, $17,000,000, which is considerably more than 35 different States in the Union will receive—if it is going to conserve the soil. The gentleman from Kansas can put the figures in the RECORD showing that the phosphate content of the Kansas land is not anywhere near what it was 5 years ago.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not know how this money is going to be distributed because we have never distributed the money on this basis before. In previous years we have had other formulas for distributing the funds, and neither the gentleman from Wisconsin nor anyone else can say how it is going to be distributed this year as between States. It will be distributed according to participation in the program by the farmers of the various States and if the gentleman's State has a high participa-

tion in the program then his State will get more money than some other State where there is not such a high participation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from South Dakota is deeply concerned, he said, about the tenants. After all, whatever services the tenants render for the money they receive is for the improvement of the land of the operator of the land, as far as that is concerned, and the operator of the land gets the benefit of the payment.

Mr. HOPE. The question is whether there will be participation in the program at all. My judgment is the gentleman's amendment will very much limit participation in the program. I think that is the idea the gentleman from South Dakota had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield to permit me to reply to my friend from Kansas by saying that soil conservation is a long-term program, that all the benefits of conserving the soil do not accrue to the tenant in any one year in which he makes the conservation effort; consequently it does not apply to that particular time.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is anything more important in this Nation today than the conservation and the building up of its soil. Certainly it is important in this hour that we place every possible acre into production and every acre should produce to its capacity. I cannot give my consent to adopting on this floor a new philosophy of government that would be comparable with saying to Mr. Henry Ford: "We will give you a Government contract to make so many trucks, but your profits cannot exceed those of the smaller plants in other cities. You may make a million trucks, the others may make only a hundred, but your profit must be confined to exactly the same amount as the smaller manufacturer."

It is difficult for me to believe that that is really the philosophy that the distinguished gentleman from Kansas is ready for his Government to adopt. This program is predicated on an acre basis. It is important, for example, that the acreage owned by the constituents of the gentleman from Connecticut, and his companies own acreage in my State, be conserved so that when the Georgia farmer is able to buy that land he will receive soil that is in good condition for cultivation and will not receive a washed-away, soil-depleted farm.

I wonder if anyone in this House has the idea that these payments amount to as much as the expense the farmer is put to in order to earn them. I will mention one case I am personally familiar with, as an example.

This farmer placed a small acreage under this program. He applied some phosphate and planted a cover crop. When he had finished on this very small acreage of about 25 acres, he had spent $340 carrying out the practices under this program. He then asked the agent to come out and tell him how much the payments would be. He was told they would total $75. He had spent $340 in order to comply with these practices. I do not know how general that is, but I think some of the Members have the idea that this is a gift; that you are getting something you are not paying for. The farmer is not only paying for it—it is costing him several times in excess of the payment he receives, and certainly it is important to him and to the Nation that he conserve and build up every acre of his land and not merely the few acres which this amendment would very probably restrict him to.

I have definitely come to this conclusion that to the farmer as well as to the Nation it is just as important to conserve and build up your soil as it is to get a good price. It does not make any difference where you fix the support price for wheat or corn or cotton or any other commodity, the farmer cannot make a living unless he can produce the crops, and he cannot produce them unless he has fertile soil to plant. Poor land, depleted soil, washed-away fields, is just about the most worthless investment there is.

We should encourage the farmer, we should cooperate with him, we should help him to conserve and build up his land, the greatest natural resource of the Nation, and try to bring it back to its original fertility. This is one of our greatest programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I will yield for a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just simply to state what I have attempted to say concerning the gentleman from Georgia, that I am in full agreement with what he had to say upon this subject and I compliment him.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST], who is now addressing the House, is one of the best friends of agriculture in this great body. During my 5 years in Congress I have observed that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] has always worked hard for the welfare of his farmers and small businessmen. This I see from the viewpoint of a man who is a farmer himself and one of the few in the House whose home today is on a farm.

Mr. GILCHRIST's high ranking on the important Committee on Agriculture has been gained by his long and faithful years of service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I thank the distinguished gentleman and Minnesota friend. I am embarrassed by such high praise. But I join with him in complimenting the gentleman from Georgia who is a safe and splendid guide in agriculture. I compliment the gentleman from Illinois, who we all agree would make a splendid President. I compliment the gentleman from Kansas who last spoke, who would make a splendid Secretary of Agriculture in the next administration. And I compliment the ideas advanced in the interrogatories of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I should like to say something on my own motion, if I could.

Mr. CASE. I want to ask the gentleman if the gentleman from Georgia had fertilized twice as many acres, would it not have cost him twice $340?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes, certainly. It is plain that this soil conservation program costs a lot of money. It costs a lot of money for anyone to put in these terraces out in my country, and then to farm the terraced fields and to conserve the fertility of the soil, and keep it from washing away and from blowing away, just as we are now trying to do in different parts of my State.

Mr. Chairman, saving soil and its fertility is something that must be done. You are derelict if you do not see that it is done, and you are not making anything in the long run by your failure, whether you are a tenant or whether you are a landlord. Soil conservation will save this country from disaster in the future. Look at worn-out China! We are now having to protect her because she has never conserved soil in the past. She wore out her lands. We should have soil saving practices, and have them now in this country of ours, and have them on the farms, whether it be on a 20-acre farm or a 200-acre farm. These figures that have been given out this afternoon by some speakers here who favor the amendment do not relate to what we have before us today, because the thing today differs from what it formerly did in past bills under which such figures were collected. This is soil conservation. It is on an acreage basis and it makes no difference whether the man's name commences with A who owns that acreage, or whether it commences with Z who owns that acreage. It is something that we ought to do and must do, and the owner of the land in a great majority of cases cannot afford to do it alone. It costs more than he can get out of it for his present income.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I would like to go ahead with one other idea, but I will gladly yield to my very congenial friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would just like to have the record straight. If he is referring to the figures that I gave, they applied to soil conservation. I did not include parity.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I accept the gentleman's statement, but nevertheless it is true that this is a thing that must be done at a great cost to the landowner.

Something was said about the tenants. A landlord who owns much land will not

go into this if he cannot get his share of the money, and the result is that he will say to the tenant, "Now, Bill, we cannot go into the thing this year," and then scarcely anybody will go into it. The big man will not go into it unless he gets a just share of the heavy expense returned to him. And then his tenant cannot go into it because he can be paid only if his landlord will allow him to go into it, and if the tenant and the landlord operate together.

Two years ago, before the same sort of an amendment was offered, I was met by a friend of mine in my home town who rented a splendid farm, and he told me, "Fred, why do you not fix it so that my landlord can go into the program, because unless he goes into the program I cannot, and we need the program?"

That is exactly the position in which the small man is. This is not a thing to help the big man or the small man. It helps everybody in the soil conservation program, and it helps the whole Nation, and it helps posterity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not have enough farmers in my district who would get over $500 under the provisions of this appropriation to rattle in a gourd. My district is largely an agricultural district but it is a district of small farms.

This proposed amendment does not interest me very much, therefore, so far as my district is concerned, but I hope I am broad enough to envision the needs of a program of this sort for the entire Nation, and not favor something which would not be particularly injurious to my district but which would, in my judgment, be disastrous to the program for the Nation as a whole.

I do not desire to be repetitious. The arguments against the amendment by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] have been so logical and so well presented that it would be presumptuous on my part to undertake to stress them by repetition, and I shall not do so. There are, however, some facts concerning this matter that have not been called to your attention and I desire to refer to them briefly.

This is a calendar-year program. The authority for announcement of the program and the authority to obligate the Government to pay the benefits provided by the program are contained, first, in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and there the obligation is limited to $500,000,000. Last year in the passage of the Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1944 the Congress made a further limitation on the maximum amount of $300,000,000 and restricted the program purely to soil-conservation and water-conservation purposes. But by the provisions of those two acts, the Department of Agriculture was authorized to announce a soil- and water-conservation program and to bind the credit of the Government to a total amount of not to exceed $300,000,000 to the farmers of the country who might enter into agreements to carry out on their individual farms the provisions of that program. That announcement has been made. Farm programs for each of the 48 States of the Union have been formulated and submitted through State triple A committees and have been approved, and the Department of Agriculture long ago announced that it would pay farmers in those several States certain stated amounts for carrying out certain soil-conservation and water-conservation practices which were provided for in their State program, and farm plans have been executed by those farmers under which they agreed to carry out these practices.

While, of course, those plans have not as yet been completely carried out, it is impossible to believe that any farmer would have agreed to make such improvements and to carry out such soil conservation or water-conservation practices and not have made plans and incurred expense long prior to this time to carry his promises into effect, so that if you now insert a provision here which will prevent the owners of large farms from receiving the pay which has been promised them by the Government for carrying out soil- and water-conservation practices on their farms, you are, in my judgment, violating the solemn obligation of the Government. If you want to adopt such an amendment, you ought to do it for the next year and not for the year for which the program has already been announced under your authority.

This amounts to an amendment of existing law on this subject, although it is presented in the form of a limitation under the Holman rule. On March 7 of this year we had up here in this House an act amending the organic act of the Department of Agriculture and authorizing a large number of different types of appropriations. Amendments to that bill, known as the Pace bill, would have been in order changing the statute law with reference to the program we are now discussing, but none was offered. I am advised that nobody appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and asked them to include in that bill any amendment of existing law such as is now proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REESE]. Certainly, the opportunity to legislate when Congress was legislating on the subject ought not to have been neglected and then an effort made in the agricultural appropriation bill to provide legislation on this important matter. I sincerely hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

To carry out the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and moisture conservation to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other agencies, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to exceed $1,089,837 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase of books and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this act shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 67, line 23, after the word "equipment", insert ": *Provided further*, That in any case in which a State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil-conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil-conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have conferred with the majority of this subcommittee—all of them I was able to contact—and we are willing to agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important activities administered by the Department of Agriculture is the Soil Conservation Service. It is belatedly conserving and protecting one of our most valuable national resources. It is annually saving and redeeming millions of acres of fertile soil which otherwise would be washing away into the rivers of the Nation leaving vast areas depleted, gullied, and eroded beyond hope of redemption.

The Soil Conservation Service is one of the few agencies for which the 1945 appropriation is increased over that provided for 1944, and received the largest increase of any item in the bill—an increase of $5,505,650 over last year—providing a total of $29,637,248 for the coming year.

Perhaps the most effective means yet devised by the Soil Conservation Service for combatting erosion is through technical cooperation with local soil-conservation districts organized and chartered under laws specifically enacted for the purpose by the various States. This system was organized about 1936 and has been so successful and has spread so rapidly that the legislatures of every State, with one possible exception, have now enacted legislation providing for this form of cooperation. My own State was one of the last, if not the last, to adopt the system. In four consecutive sessions of the General Assembly of Missouri soil districts bills were rejected. But at the last session of the State legislature a compromise bill was finally agreed on in collaboration between representatives of our local farm organizations and representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture. The principal feature of this compromise bill provided for approval of soil-conservation policies and programs by the Missouri State Districts Commission before submission to the local soil-conservation districts. The provision was approved by the Soil Conservation officials of the Department of Agriculture and was enacted only on assurance of Federal compliance and cooperation on those terms.

This amendment is in conformity with that agreement and with the provisions of the Missouri soils districts law enacted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri. I trust it will have the approval of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether any of the funds provided for research work on soil conservation and for experimental work can apply to Indian reservations?

Mr. TARVER. I do not recall that that subject matter was discussed in the hearings. There would appear to be no reason why research work on soil conservation should not be conducted in part on Indian reservations if the administrative authorities deem such work to be essential or of value. The question has never been raised before, as far as I know, in the deliberations of the committee, but I know of no reason why they could not conduct such work there.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the chairman. I refer particularly at this time to the Navajo Indian Reservation in northeastern Arizona, which is a part of the watershed of the Colorado River. That area has been terribly overgrazed and it is now being eroded rapidly. Lake Mead is being filled up at an unusually rapid rate, so that I think the matter requires immediate attention, inasmuch as great property investments are at hazard. No doubt the appropriation for such work should come in another bill for another department, but I do not want to be remiss in my duty by failing to call the attention of Congress to this imperative need on every possible occasion.

Some remarkable experiments are being carried on and other experiments should be conducted involving reseeding and revegetating such overgrazed and eroded areas. I have been trying to get one of the departments to try out Dr. Lytle Adams' airplane seeding device which, in my opinion, may prove to have a greater value in our Nation's well-being than has his air-mail pick-up invention. At the close of the war and immediately thereafter is the right time to be ready to use such a significant process. Airplanes and many skillful flyers will be available and other materials will be available after the war to make full use of any such feasible process which has been proven.

In regard to the need of and usefulness of soil conservation I am in agreement with the chairman the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and I am also glad to see some leaders on the other side of the central aisle have changed their minds and now recognize the need of a soil-conservation program. Reseeding, revegetating, and reforesting our barren and worn-out lands wherever possible and feasible is a part of that rebuilding of resources which we have so often wasted.

It delighted me in general debate to hear my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] tell so enthusiastically of the successful growing of trees on the treeless plains in the shelterbelt projects. If man will quit destroying such valuable resources, nature alone through a long time can do wonders in restoring them, but if man will be as wise in helping to restore them as he has been foolish in depleting them, the restoration can be very quickly done.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I call to the attention of the House a news item in today's Washington Post which should be given the very careful scrutiny of every Member of this body:

KAISER SEEKS NOD TO BEGIN RECONVERSION—EAGER TO START WORK ON 30 CARGO SHIPS FOR INDIES GOVERNMENT

Henry J. Kaiser, west coast shipbuilder, yesterday laid down a challenge to the Government to permit him to convert his yards to commercial production as soon as materials, manpower, and facilities are available.

The challenge was laid down by his announcement that the Netherlands Indies Government had expressed its intent to enter into a contract with the Kaiser Co., Inc., to construct 30 coastwise cargo vessels in his No. 4 yard at Richmond, Calif., and that he would begin work on the contract some time this year as facilities are made available at the yard by the expiration of outstanding war contracts.

Kaiser said the deal would be on a cash—lump sum—basis, not covered by lend-lease. He did not disclose the amount involved or details of the ships' design other than to say that they will be shallow-draft vessels.

CONFIDENT HE CAN DELIVER

Kaiser acknowledged that he was still to receive an allocation of materials for the project from the War Production Board, but he predicted that sufficient steel to go ahead would be available later in the year.

Mr. Chairman, if these ships were needed for the war effort today there would be no objection on my part. Note, however, that these are for a foreign nation for use following the war. Note particularly the last paragraph, in which Mr. Kaiser predicts that sufficient steel will be available later in the year.

For the past 3 or more months I have been trying to obtain consideration for House Joint Resolution 201, which would direct W. P. B. to increase by 25 percent the production of farm implements over the 1940 schedule. I have urged early allocation of this additional 250,000 tons of steel so that the farmers of our Nation might have labor-saving machinery, such as corn pickers, tractors, and combines to help make up for the manpower necessarily stripped from the farms.

Mr. Chairman, what cooperation does W. P. B. accord those of us seeking to give the farmers this helping hand toward food production? Let me quote here a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of W. P. B., to Mr. FULMER, head of our Committee on Agriculture:

MARCH 13, 1944.

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your inquiry of January 20 asking for a report on House Joint Resolution 201, a joint resolution "relating to the allocation of steel for the manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements."

This resolution would make mandatory allocation of steel for the domestic manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements without any reference to the war production picture as a whole. Such a mandatory allocation and the resultant production would seriously disrupt the production of components for our highest rated military products such as landing craft, aircraft, and military trucks, which are vitally needed in the conduct of military operations in all theaters of war. I am opposed, therefore, to this joint resolution and strongly urge that it be not passed.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,
DONALD M. NELSON, *Chairman.*

Surely, Mr. Chairman, if W. P. B. can even consider at this time the allocation of steel and critical materials to Mr. Kaiser for building ships for a foreign government to use after the war is over, surely he could also give more sympathetic consideration to my request for this farm-implement allocation for the production of food, not only for ourselves, but for our allies and starving people throughout the world.

There are those in our Government today who refuse to recognize that food itself is a critical material, both in winning the war and evolving a just and lasting peace.

We have had pointed out to us the past few days the potential demands of U. N. R. R. A. for our farm implements. I serve notice here today that it will be my intention, if possible, to place a prohibition in its appropriation bill against U. N. R. R. A. expending a cent of its

appropriation to take farm machinery away from our farmers who desperately need it and export the estimated 186,000 tons out of our country to any foreign nation at this time.

Thank God, Congress still has the power of the purse strings and that seems to be the only form of persuasion this overstaffed, wasteful bureaucracy will listen to.

A year and one-half ago, in a speech to the House, I stated: "We have enough food today but how about tomorrow."

Today it is my firm conviction that unless more consideration is given to the farmers, both as to manpower and farm machinery, our beloved Nation may want for sufficient food, let alone have enough for the starving peoples of war-torn lands, much as we might wish to help them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, $1,267,290.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the item that has just been read is the item for market news service on which I want to say a few words. It was a few months ago that a market news service was instituted in the Los Angeles market, covering poultry products, and other things. But it is with poultry products that I am primarily concerned here. I ask for this time in order to state that in my judgment this service to the farmers is one of the most important services performed by the Department of Agriculture. Without it the farmer who comes to market with his eggs, for example, is subject to having to sell these eggs under conditions where all he has to go by is the price quotation of the buyer. Sometimes markets are seriously under the control of a few buyers or an association of buyers. In order for the farmer to have the protection of a really free and open market this market news service is, in my judgment, of very great importance. The item which the committee has included under this heading is the budget estimate, plus a slight increase, as I understand it, in order to make it possible for a fruit and vegetable service to be instituted at three points where they were not in effect last year. I frankly wish that the item could have been increased by an additional $52,000 approximately, in order to make possible some expansion of the market news service for poultry and dairy products in some of the more important markets of the country, one of them being the Los Angeles market that affects the farmers of the district I represent.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks herewith a brief description of what that extra $52,000 would do in expanding this service and rounding it out in these other points. I realize that without further discussion and without the Members being more familiar with some of these matters than they are at present an amendment might not be adopted at this time to provide this $52,000 increase.

But I earnestly hope that if in the course of the next year there arises any difficulty about carrying on the market-news services at any of these points, it can be taken care of by the deficiency appropriation committee, and to say that it is my earnest and honest hope that when another body considers this matter it may be possible for the dairy and poultry people who have an interest in this matter to be heard on the possibility of this additional fund.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. We recently had a very striking example of the need for a market-news service in the Northwest when there was a glut in the stockyards and the packing plants, due to the shortage of manpower, and when the producers of livestock loaded up their stock and came into a glutted stockyard and could not even be allowed to unload and had to carry the stock back, and they had no way of knowing the conditions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank my good friend from Idaho very much indeed. I would like to add that those who feel that the Market News Service is not important because we have price ceilings, are entirely wrong. At this time eggs are selling on the Los Angeles market at low prices, considering the cost of production to the poultrymen. The Market News Service is quite as necessary now as it has ever been.

Mr. Chairman, listed below are markets where there is need for inaugurating or expanding market news:

First. Los Angeles: Additional funds should be provided in order to expand the local market-news program in line with the needs and demands of producer groups which for some time have been pressing the Federal and State departments of agriculture for more comprehensive information. Los Angeles has become an increasingly important market during recent years. Although located in a State with a tremendously large production of dairy and poultry products, the immediate territory may be classified as a deficit area. Eggs and poultry move south from the San Joaquin Valley to Los Angeles, or may move north to San Francisco. Producers' interests will be best served only when adequate reports are available at Los Angeles as well as at San Francisco. Dairy products move to Los Angeles regularly from as far north as eastern Washington and Idaho, and intermittent supplies from the Middle West. Market reports from Los Angeles are of particular significance to producers and shippers in the entire area west of the Rockies.

Second. New Orleans: The market news service at New Orleans was discontinued July 1, 1943, when Federal market news funds were reduced. Under the former arrangement, the service was on a Federal-State basis, under a cooperative agreement with the Louisiana State Market Commission, with funds provided by both agencies. This was the first service provided in a major southern market, and the information assembled regarding market receipts and supplies was of particular value during the spring of 1943 when maximum price-control programs were inaugurated by the O. P. A. The service should be reestablished in order to provide producers over a wide area in the South with bona fide information regarding market supplies, trends, and prices. If Federal funds were available, it is hoped that the working agreement with the State market commission might be resumed.

Third. Kansas City: Thus far funds have not permitted the establishment of an office in this market. Kansas City is a central point in a large producing area from which products move east, south, and west. It is also a key passing point. The nearest market now reported is Chicago, and because of distance, producers in the Kansas City area are not adequately served.

Fourth. Seattle: The service at Seattle has necessarily been limited in scope, through lack of funds, and is now further handicapped by lack of teletype service. Seattle is a key market from a national standpoint, and is the most important market in the Northwest. Large quantities of dairy and poultry products move south and east from this area, as the production of these products are major agricultural enterprises in the territory served by the Seattle office.

Fifth. Detroit: Detroit is a major consuming market, with an estimated consuming population of two and one-half million. It is less important than Seattle as a distributing market, although it, too, is located in the midst of a major producing area. No service has been established there, except a small project dealing with Government graded eggs only, handled in cooperation with the State department of agriculture in conjunction with other work. Information should be provided regarding supplies, market receipts, storage movements, consumption, and prices, in order to place producers and shippers in a position to properly compare this market with alternative outlets.

Sixth. Cincinnati: No service is now available on this market, which is an important outlet for a large producing area in the Ohio Valley, and also serves as an important shipping and distributing point. Local market reports on eggs and live poultry would be the type of work first emphasized.

Seventh. Fort Worth: No market news service is now provided at any point in the Southwest region. Fort Worth is the center of a major producing and shipping

area. Considerable quantities of shell eggs from this area have been converted into dried eggs for sale on Government purchase contracts. Fort Worth is also important as a point for collecting shipping point information, and for disseminating terminal market information to producing and shipping interests.

Eighth. New York City: A major office is in operation at New York City, but an additional market reporter is needed to adequately cover all products reported. There should also be a man in training there to handle emergency situations, to relieve the live poultry market reporter who is employed jointly under the Federal-State cooperative agreement as occasions may arise, and to provide relief help as needed at Philadelphia and Boston.

Ninth. Chicago: A major office is maintained at Chicago, but an additional market reporter is needed to assist in covering all the products handled, and to be available for emergency relief.

Tenth. Washington, D. C.: The Washington office faces the danger of having to depend upon supplemental allotments to take care of present commitments, and has not been able to finance the cost of properly reporting the local egg and poultry market.

The estimated cost of developing the service as above outlined is indicated below. These amounts provide for full-time market reports, necessary clerical assistance, supplies, equipment, telephone, and rent where Federal space is not available.

Los Angeles	$6,000
New Orleans	4,000
Kansas City	7,000
Seattle	6,000
Detroit	7,000
Cincinnati	7,000
Fort Worth	6,500
New York City	5,200
Chicago	2,600
Washington, D. C	1,000
Total	52,300

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, no doubt the market news service is of some value to the farmers. I know the A. A. A. is of a great political value to the New Dealers. In the last few days we have been told how the A. A. A. sells itself by requiring the farmers to sign up if they want gasoline, if their sons want deferment from the draft.

My memory goes back 5 or 6 years——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What has that got to do with the Market News Service?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a part of the market news service that the A. A. A. was using; to sell itself to the farmers, not only furnishing the people news about crops, but furnishing them news about the desirability. Why does the gentleman walk away? He asks a question—I am trying to answer his question. The A. A. A. was trying recently to tell the people that they had better join up with the triple A if they want gas. The gentleman from Illinois and others told you about that yesterday. The farmers have been given to understand they had better join up with the A. A. A. if they wanted their sons to escape the draft or if they wanted gas from the rationing board. But my memory goes back 5 or 6 years. There goes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] again walking away without waiting for an answer to the question he asked—my memory goes back to the time when one of the farm agencies was loaning money to the farmers and it required every farmer who borrowed a dollar to sign a written agreement that he would not say a thing against the triple A as long as there was a dollar unpaid on the principal, as long as there was any interest unpaid on the loan. That was the way they then distributed news about the desirability of the triple A.

Down in my own home county they had 123 township committeemen. They were in the habit of calling some of them in in April for 10 days' instruction. They called them in every year, and they paid them $4.50 per day each. The farmers did not happen to be very busy at that time of the year. Then they would put on the bulletin board in some of the offices a sentiment like this: "If your Congressman"—and they named him, I will not name him—"if your Congressman had voted for more appropriations for the triple A, you would have received more money this year." That is the way they distributed news. That was news that was supposed to help a sale of the New Deal—not of farm products. So it was suggested that farmers vote against the sitting Congressman who had not voted for increases in appropriations for the A. A. A. Forty-five dollars for each of those farmers who came in there every year to the school of instruction, and its one purpose was to disseminate news which it was thought would sell the A. A. A. to the farmers. About what? About the desirability of becoming New Dealers, and getting their names on the pay roll. That is the way they did it at that time. If that is a part of Farm News Service, if the New Deal is getting so inefficient, so wasteful, so incompetent, so extravagant in its expenditure of public money that they have to pay fellows to come in and join up and accept those payments—if we must do that—the New Deal must be in a bad situation. The farmers in my district were objecting. They said, "If these administrators did not take all this money we would get more for our crops, more for conservation." Of course they would. But it is like so many of these New Deal agencies, the administrative expenses eat up the money that should be used for payments in working for the perpetuation of their big bosses in office down here, the money which should go to the dirt farmer goes to the politician who works the farmer. It makes it rather binding for a Congressman who is limited in his campaign expenditures to have to fight an opposition New Deal campaign financed by the taxpayers. Then on top of it comes this political action committee with several million dollars, and they dip their fingers into the union dues, which in the end come out of the taxpayer in the increased price of the product made or transported.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you have gotten over on this side of the aisle and I note you have and become converted, yes; I will yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of the market news service for farmers, giving them the benefit of that service in determining their sale price.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I think, perhaps, if there is anything good in the New Deal, that would be a good idea. I am for legislation which will aid the farmers as distinguished from the political farmer. I will ask the gentleman if he is in favor of keeping grafters in office who are using the taxpayers' money?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am in favor of putting out grafters of every sort, wherever they may be.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why do you not support some of these amendments when we try to do it? Answer that, will you? Why do you not support some of these amendments? The money should go to the farmers, not to the administrators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to refer to page 59 of the bill, and to the colloquy that took place yesterday between the chairman of the subcommittee and my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. This proviso appears on page 59 of the bill, and I would like to read it:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products or administration of such orders.

Mr. Chairman, I received a telegram from San Francisco, on yesterday, which reads as follows:

Agriculture Department appropriation bill now before House contains rider which would make operation of FDO 79 practically impossible. FDO 79 is operating satisfactorily under the circumstances and its elimination would doubtlessly necessitate undesirable methods of control of milk sale. This rider must be removed and we urgently request your active efforts to that end. Please keep me advised.

This is signed by Hanns Stratmann, 1325 Potrero Avenue, for San Francisco milk distributors.

I conferred with several members of the committee about this provision in the bill and wired Mr. Stratmann as follows:

Retel bill mentioned is being debated on floor today. I immediately personally con-

tacted members of the committee and I am pleased to advise Mr. Shields, Solicitor for Department of Agriculture, advised committee on special inquiry today that those groups operating under marketing agreements or in case of cooperatives will not be affected.

Today I received a telegram, which reads as follows:

Nobody in California is operating under Federal marketing agreement. We are paying assessment for operation of FDO 79. If such assessments be outlawed FDO 79 may have to be discontinued. We fear rider will make dead letter of FDO 79.

Immediately on receipt of this telegram I telephoned the Department of Agriculture and Mr. Shields was not in. His assistant told me that if this provision is continued, unless it is amended in the Senate or in conference, probably a situation will develop as set forth in the telegram, because it develops that in California there are no marketing agreements covering milk.

I just want to bring this before the House so that when the bill goes to conference the members of the conference committee will be advised.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. There is no reason whatever for the apprehension expressed by the gentleman from California. F. D. O. orders which have been issued by the War Food Administration may continue to be kept in effect, and the administrative expenses necessary in connection therewith paid from the administrative funds appropriated for the War Food Administration by Congress.

We believe that an adequate amount of money is carried in this bill for their use to take care of that administrative expense. Of course, if they are able to convince the Senate that more money is necessary, there is a possibility of the Senate, in passing upon this bill, granting more funds, but there is no reason why this rider, as it is called, should be removed because of the fears expressed by the gentleman's constituent who has wired about this matter.

Mr. ROLPH. In other words, my constituents are protected?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly. If they desire the continued effectiveness of one of these orders which limits the quota of milk or dairy products which can be delivered and be distributed by a handler or producer in a certain area in California, if they think that order is necessary and is doing a good job for the producers in that area, they should be satisfied with its continuance at Government expense, because it can be continued notwithstanding this proviso.

The only difference would be that the administrative expense would be paid by the Government instead of being paid by the producer or by the producer-handler.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the chairman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, speaking of the United States marketing news service purely as a business proposition it is unfortunate, as I see it, that politics and political comment should be injected into these proceedings. We had a very striking example of the need of marketing information in the Northwest recently; and when I speak of the Northwest I am speaking of the States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. We have several large packing centers out there where the farmers market their livestock. Under the rules of the O. P. A. and the War Production Board all the livestock for market has been funneled into these big packing centers. The people who raise their cattle in the hills must take them to market as soon as the snow falls on the hills and the ground freezes. They store only enough hay to support and maintain the carry-over herd. We do not feed cattle in the Northwest by shipping them to feeders and graining them like they do in the eastern and central sections of the country; we grass-fatten our cattle, sheep, and things of that kind and move them into market as soon as the market season arrives. When this season arrived in the Northwest this year there was such an acute shortage of manpower in these big packing plants and the little packing plants have been put out of business by the rules and regulations of the O. P. A. and the War Production Board—so that the growers were entirely dependent upon these big packing plants for a market—these farmers would load their livestock into trucks or railway cars and take them 50 or 100 miles to a packing plant only to find the yards were glutted and they could not even unload. And in many cases they were forced to truck their livestock all the way back home. They had no news, no information concerning that condition. An appeal was made to the Members of Congress from those Western States to do something about it. It proved to be a very difficult problem. A certain wage structure was maintained by the big packing plants all over the country. Their wage rate in the Northwest was below the prevailing wage scale. The War Labor Board said we could not raise wages or authorize a wage unless employees and employers petitioned them to do so. I said to them that if they waited until the employees in the packing plants could go through the tedious, long delay of asking for a wage increase that way they were mistaken, for the men could step right across the street and get a better job and better pay; that they would have to wait a long time and that the people would go hungry, unless something was done and done promptly to relieve the packing-house situation. Nothing was done until we appealed finally to the Secretary of the Navy to furlough some of the experienced slaughterhouse employees from nearby Farragut Naval Training Station to let them go back into the packing plants and relieve the glut and get this food moving. We made the appeal and said to Mr. Knox that in the Civil War and in the Spanish-American War when the Army wanted beef it simply sent a detail out to bring in the meat and that he could just as well detail his sailors to go out and operate these packing plants so that the Army and Navy could have meat. That was done; but what these farmers need, what these livestock producers need up in these isolated sections of the country is information as to the condition of the market and whether their stock would be received when they hauled them to the markets. I am in full support of this program and regret exceedingly that politics should enter a matter of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $2,550,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 13 in order to ask a question.

Mr. Chairman, this is the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, but under the general provisions of the bill on page 87 I find this language:

Employment by Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed 20 junior engineers who are citizens of other American republics.

This is contained in a paragraph which exempts the employment of those residents of other American republics from the provisions of existing law.

Will the gentleman tell me why it is necessary to employ these junior engineers and pay them out of this appropriation when we have plenty such qualified men in this country?

Mr. TARVER. I believe the gentleman today has raised the very same point I raised last year in the hearings. We were assured then by authorities in the Government in whose views we had the utmost confidence that this program under which certain students from South American countries are permitted to come into the United States and receive training of this kind is of the utmost importance not only in the maintenance of amicable relations with our southern neighbors, but for the advantage of trade with those countries represented in that these students who come in and are trained as electrical engineers go back to South America friendly toward this country and will to some extent influence trade relations. In the development of electrical projects there they will naturally contact trade sources in this country from which the supplies will come which they will need in their activities. We were convinced that this program, while prima facie it might not have been justified, is in reality of very great value to this country and should be continued.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri yield that I may ask a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does not this practice constitute a breach of the contract labor law?

Mr. TARVER. No; not at all.

Mr. WHITE. It in effect is bringing these people into this country and allowing them to work for pay.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman for the information, and ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOREN: Page 78, line 5, add the following: "*Provided*, That the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Rural Electrification Administration') and expended or loaned under the authority conferred by section 4 of the act approved May 20, 1936, shall be used only to finance the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems, for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not now receiving central station service: *Provided further*, That none of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Rural Electrification Administration') shall be used to finance the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems in any area of the United States included within the boundaries of any city, village, or borough having a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that, rather than being a limitation on the appropriation, this is a change in the substantive law that authorized the Rural Electrification Administration; and I call the attention of the Chair to a ruling that was handed down on April 19, 1943, when substantially the same amendment was offered, the only difference being that the word "exclusively" has now been changed to "only." I submit those words have exactly the same meaning and that the ruling applied at that time would be applicable at this time.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOREN. Is it the gentleman's point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands the point of order to be that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, that is right.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the proposed amendment merely reaffirms existing law. It does not change existing law. It does not change existing law or the substantive law that created the Rural Electrification Administration or that governs its organization and I submit that the proposals are limiting to the appropriation in that the sole purpose and object of the proposals are to prevent the use of this particular money outside the provisions of existing law. That is, that they cannot use the particular money involved in the appropriation in line 5, page 78, to buy out electrical systems in towns in excess of a population of 1,500.

Mr. Chairman, to support my contention that this is existing law I want to say that the language of the first proviso is lifted directly from section 4 of the R. E. A. Act approved May 20, 1936, section 4 of which reads as follows:

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized and empowered, from the sums hereinbefore authorized, to make loans to persons, corporations, States, Territories, and subdivisions and agencies thereof, municipalities, peoples, utility districts and cooperatives, nonprofit, or limited-dividend associations organized under the laws of any State or Territory of the United States, for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service.

That language is the language that is in the act of May 20, 1936, substantially word for word.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair may interrupt the gentleman, if it is existing law what is the necessity for it being in the amendment?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, the Chair anticipates the point of my discussion in justifying the amendment. The reason is that so far as appropriations are concerned, they have issued opinions down there by a circuitous route and have managed to go ahead and buy electrical systems in towns with a population in excess of 1,500. They have done it in connection with other appropriations. So I want to pick up this particular $20,000,000 and say that this $20,000,000 shall not be expended in that illegal fashion.

Mr. Chairman, the language of the second proviso is lifted directly from section 13 of the R. E. A. Act approved May 20, 1936. Section 13 reads as follows:

SEC. 13. As used in this act the term "rural area" shall be deemed to mean any area of the United States not included within the boundaries of any city, village, or borough having a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants, and such term shall be deemed to include the farm and nonfarm population thereof.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I served on the committee which created the R. E. A. and I was a member of the subcommittee that created it. I have a thorough familiarity with the act and with the amendments that have been made to the act since its original creation. I know what was in the mind of the committee when this organization was created. But in spite of that, they are spending this money to buy electrical plants in towns with a population as high as 10,000 people. I want to limit the use of this appropriation so that they cannot buy out existing facilities in cities having populations of ten or twenty thousand.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the point of order is not substantiated by the facts in this case. First, this is a limitation and, second, the language used has been lifted verbatim from the substantive act creating this organization.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to say that the amendment was lifted word for word from the existing law. I have not seen the amendment, Mr. Chairman, in writing, I have only heard it read, but I understood from the reading of the amendment that the word "only" is in the amendment. The amendment states, as I understand it, that this money shall be used only for these purposes. When you refer to the existing law the word "only" is not in existing law. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us whether the word "only" has been inserted in the proposed amendment?

Mr. BOREN. In reply to the gentleman's question, I said that this language was lifted almost verbatim.

Mr. POAGE. I asked whether it was verbatim.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, let us take the word "only".

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman will answer my question as to whether he has inserted the word "only," whether the amendment is verbatim with the present law or whether it is not?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk can inform the gentleman about that. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be reread, and I point out that the word "only" is a limiting word.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Boren amendment.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, just one final word in explanation of my position. In the first instance, we inserted the word "only" which is a limiting word only. They have been doing it not for this purpose but for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the word "only" appear in the statute, in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

Mr. BOREN. The word "only" does not appear in the statute. That is in the second proviso. Neither do the words "shall not be used for other purposes" but I make the contention that is the thing that makes it limiting.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Would the gentleman's amendment expand the basic law and authorize expenditures for anything not authorized in the basic law?

Mr. BOREN. It does not. It is solely limiting.

Mr. CASE. In the use of the word "only," does that word "only" limit the appropriation to expenditures for only a particular purpose?

Mr. BOREN. It does not. It does not preclude any of the purposes in the substantive law.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the gentleman would explain this. My understanding of a limitation is that it restricts the appropriation to a portion of the original purposes. You cannot expand an appropriation but you can restrict it. If the use of the word "only" limits to only a certain part of the basic appropriation, then it is a restriction and a limitation.

Mr. BOREN. My amendment does not in any iota expand or take in any new purposes. It limits the practice that is going on.

The reason I answered the gentleman as I did is, I am unwilling, in my own judgment, to hold that the other practices outside of this limitation are justified by law, but it does limit them in some of the practices they are carrying on that they are claiming come under the law.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the gentleman's interpretation of the word "only," it is synonymous to saying at that point in his amendment that "this money shall be used for no other purposes than."

Mr. BOREN. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is ready to rule.

Reference has been made to similar amendments that have been heretofore presented. It has also been stated that the language of the amendment offered is identical with an amendment presented on April 19, 1943, but an examination of the amendment offered at that time will show that the language was considerably and materially different than the language of the proposed amendment. Aside from that, the Chair is more anxious to be correct than perhaps consistent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want it to be understood that I said that the wording of these amendments were identical.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so state that the gentleman or any other Member said that. That was brought to the attention of the Chair a few minutes ago. As the Chair stated, he is more interested in being correct than consistent.

Inasmuch as it is conceded that the language of the first proviso is the language of the substantive law except for the word "only," the first proviso is a limitation, and in view of the fact the second proviso is also a limitaiton, the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I wonder whether or not agreement can be reached as to limitation of time on this amendment.

Mr. BOREN. I do not know whether others wish to discuss this point or at what length, but I can assure the gentleman so far as I am concerned the 5 minutes allocated me will be adequate for my purpose.

Mr. TARVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate be limited to 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss this subject at any length at all. I only ask your careful attention for a couple of minutes.

I have presented to the Subcommittee on Appropriations a full case history of what is going on in R. E. A. management in violation of the intent of the law. I extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this summary of facts, and again yesterday I extended in the RECORD at some length an analysis of the so-called Comptroller General's opinion and other statements that have been made on this subject which the R. E. A. has laid claim to in their annual report and which are without foundation; and some of their allegations are absolutely false.

Here is the point at issue. I sat on the committee that helped pass this act at the time it was passed, and participated in most of the subsequent considerations that have been given to the subject. The committee specifically wrote into the law that they could not buy established electrical systems in the large cities. We had one purpose when we created R. E. A. We wanted electricity carried to the farmer in the rural area, to the fellow who is not now getting electricity. There was no thought that the R. E. A. would be used to go in and buy up electrical systems and operate like a private industry, doing business for profit. Every nickel that the R. E. A. has spent has been used for buying electrical facilities in cities.

We did recognize that there would be some small villages in a rural area, so we authorized and let them buy in towns up to 1,500 population.

In Missouri alone they bought out over 30 towns in excess of that population. In my State they bought out 2 and are negotiating for a third. More than 100 towns have been bought within the last 2 years, some of them with populations ranging as high as from 10,000 to 25,000 people.

I do not believe this Congress ever thought for a moment when it voted R. E. A. appropriations that that money was going to be loaned to somebody to buy electrical facilities in some towns ranging in population anywhere from the size of Richmond, Va., to Dallas or Houston, Tex., or what have you. Of course, these towns may not be that large, but they range from 10,000, my home town—we do not consider ourselves eligible at all to enter into a rural cooperative electrification program, within the city limits, I mean—a town of 10,000 people, but under this program they are buying out towns right and left like that.

The unfortunate thing about it is, in addition to taking this money and diverting it away from the farmer for other purposes, they are buying out the "cats and dogs" of the electrical utility systems. They are buying out the worthless ones. They will buy anything almost that is offered, and in many instances, as I pointed out in my full discussion, they have paid prices that have been in excess of any offers made by anybody else. They have even bought one system in excess of the price at which the system was first offered.

I do not mean to impeach their integrity in connection with these manipulations; I mean they are seeking a place to spend money. Why? Because in this temporary period the money that has been appropriated to them they have not been able to use for legitimate purposes. They are violating the act. They are buying cities and they are betraying the farmer, taking the money to the city that we intended for the farmer. If you want to buy cities, if you want us to appropriate money to buy electrical systems in the cities of this country, well and good; but let us decide that here, where that policy ought to be decided. Let us not by edict or arbitrary decisions circumvent the law. That is the problem we face in this country. If a man believes in government by law and believes that the law should be carried out by administrative agencies, then I do not believe it is possible to vote against the amendment I have offered.

I want to point out to you that the R. E. A. in these instances has definitely considered the law which the Congress wrote as of no more binding effect than a scrap of paper.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think we are in agreement that the purposes of the R. E. A. should be, and are, to provide cheaper electricity for rural homes. If it is necessary in order to provide that to operate the systems in some small rural communities it seems to me it will be necessary in some instances that we acquire the facilities which cover

small towns as well as the rural areas that surround them. The R. E. A. has done that in 11 cases during its history. Two of those cases were in the district represented by the gentleman from Oklahoma, or at least were in the State of Oklahoma. They were Fairfax and Cleveland, Okla. In the history of the R. E. A. there have been only 11 acquisitions of property where towns of more than 1,500 population were involved. In the last 2 fiscal years there have been only 2 such acquisitions. I cite that to make it clear that there has been no tendency, as has been suggested, on the part of the R. E. A. to go into the utility business or to seek to secure for itself a hold upon city properties.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Do I understand the gentleman to say there have been only 11 towns in excess of 1,500 population purchased?

Mr. POAGE. I said there have been 11 acquisitions during the history of the R. E. A. There have been 16 towns involved. I will put the names of those towns in the RECORD, together with the population of the towns. Of those 16 towns, 10 were of less than 2,000 population, 5 from 2,000 to 3,000, and 1 had a population of 3,400. That is the tremendous record of the R. E. A. in trying to become a big public utility, as the gentleman would like to have us believe it is doing.

In buying these, the R. E. A. bought properties in every instance in which more than 50 percent of the money was spent to provide new rural service to rural subscribers. I have the list here. In every instance of acquisition where we have as much as 1 year's history, there has been a betterment of the fiscal conditions of the local cooperative that made the acquisition. In every single instance it has inured to the advantage of the R. E. A. and to the farmers who owned the local cooperative.

It is perfectly true that in Oklahoma, where this last acquisition took place, there was a competitive power company that wanted to buy that power and offered $20,000 more than the R. E. A. paid for it, but it did not offer it until after the R. E. A. had made the trade and got it under a binding contract.

If you are interested in protecting these power companies simply so that they can hold a community without giving rural service, without serving anybody out in the rural areas, and simply say that they can sit there because, perchance, there happens to be some town of as much as 1,500 population in the area, then you vote for this amendment and keep a lot of people in the dark the rest of their lives. But if you are interested in seeing the R. E. A. extend its lines to all of those people in the rural areas, then you give them a chance to do so by allowing them to do just as the law allows them to do today.

I call your attention to the fact that of these 11 acquisitions, 6 of them were in the Tennessee Valley area, where there were already established operations that involved both town and rural areas before the R. E. A. was established, and it became desirable for those properties to be taken over by the R. E. A. and operated as local cooperatives rather than as agencies of the T. V. A. or the local agencies that existed there. Six of the 11 acquisitions in the United States have been of that nature.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma would not only seek to destroy, but the first part of his amendment would prevent any acquisitions, prevent the R. E. A. from taking anything that is now in existence, prevent it from taking over any of the old properties that could fit in nicely with its own operations but which do not fit in with existing operations. This amendment would prevent the R. E. A. from taking advantage of those properties that must go on the market as a result of the death-sentence clause of the Securities Act, which breaks up the holding companies. Every one of us knows that within the next few years there must be many of these properties come on the market.

If you want to vote simply to protect those properties, and keep them in the hands of the utility companies, with no opportunity for the farmers of this country to buy any of those properties for their own good, if you want to say that those properties are to remain for the benefit of the utilities and that no farmer in America can enjoy the advantages of the death-sentence clause, then you vote for this amendment, because it will dead sure guarantee that the utilities and not the farmers will get the benefit of that act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not unsympathetic with the general objective which my good friend from Oklahoma has in mind of conserving rural electrification funds for the farmers, but the situation is not quite so simple as it would appear, because there have been a great many rulings by the Comptroller General and a great deal of discussion about this very matter.

I share the belief, of course, that this money ought to be used for strictly farm purposes. That is the reason the interdiction was written into the law that it should be limited to localities of 1,500 people. But now here is a situation that arises. Imagine an area that may have the general conformity of this Chamber, in any State in the Union, that is made up largely of unserved rural electric customers. In order to do the job, it becomes necessary to get at this group of unserved customers to acquire a utility property that may be in a town somewhat larger than 1,500. Those very questions, and there have been a number of them, have been submitted to the Office of the Comptroller, and it is a matter of fact that the subcommittee submitted that very question last year and the year before. The Comptroller ruled in a very extensive decision that where the acquisition in a town of over 1,500 is incidental and contributory to the serving of people in a hitherto unserved area, he thought it was in conformity with existing law. In pursuance thereof, they have acquired some properties in towns of 2,000. I think the largest town was about 3,500, as I recall.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Is the gentleman familiar with the Sho-Me Cooperative in Missouri?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not too familiar with that particular one.

Mr. BOREN. This is a holding-company type of cooperative, and it has bought out some thirty-odd units, and in at least one instance the population was over 10,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That particular case has not come to my attention, but I am sure my good friend is familiar with the observations made by the general counsel of R. E. A. in connection with a memorandum which he filed with the committee.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to correct the gentleman from Oklahoma about the Sho-Me Cooperative.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The Public Service Commission of Missouri authorized and sanctioned the acquisition. It is merely the consolidation of these different units into a larger unit so that they can more effectively serve the people coming within the jurisdiction of these old cooperatives. It has been approved by the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The general counsel makes this observation, and I read it for the benefit of the Committee of the Whole:

> With respect to such communities, a study of our records, made this week, indicates that there have been only a few towns or small cities having populations of more than 1,500—most of them under 2,000, and the largest approximately 3,500.

But in the language of the ruling of the Comptroller, it was incidental to and contributory to the basic function of R. E. A. to provide service for people in unserved areas.

In the light of that ruling, which was necessary in order that there be an interpretation of the authority contained in the basic statute, it would occur to me inadvisable to adopt this amendment. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], that I think the real relief is to be found perhaps in a more meticulous refinement of the law wherever there have been abuses. If we want to say nothing over 1,500, then we should make it so specific that not even the Comptroller General in making an interpretation for the service of unserved areas can go beyond that 1,500. But in the light of that ruling, in the light of the fact that he seeks to interpret whether money is being taken out of the Federal Treasury for this purpose, and then approves it, the subcommittee had no choice in the matter.

That is the reason I do not think the gentleman's amendment ought to prevail.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Do I correctly understand that the substantive law as passed by the Congress limited the use of these funds to villages of less than 1,500?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; except that there is the broad provision in the law for serving people in unserved areas; so the Comptroller takes the position of taking the language of the law in its entirety and then interpreting the limitation in the law that where it is incidental and contributory it can be done. So he has permitted and approved the withdrawal of funds from the Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. To begin with I want to say I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is slightly in error in the last statement made in his remarks, in that the Rural Electrification Act does not prohibit the erection of rural electric service lines in towns of 1,500 or more in population by definite provision to that effect. It does provide that the funds which are made available by Congress shall be used in the provision of electric service for unserved rural areas, and it further provides that rural areas shall include towns of 1,500 or less. Therefore, it might at a casual glance be assumed that the use of any of the funds in towns of 1,500 population or more, would be prohibited by law. However, the Comptroller General has ruled that is not the case. I raised the question myself so far as the hearings before our subcommittee are concerned, upon the theory it was not possible to use any of these moneys elsewhere than in unserved rural areas. The Comptroller General ruled that while that was the primary purpose of the law, funds could be used for the purchase of existing lines when incidental to rural service extension and where the effect of such purchase was to enable a cooperative to be set up and to function efficiently, which would carry service to unserved rural areas. That is the situation in quite a number of areas in this country, where if you set up a rural electric plan for rural people and have in the middle of it a town of maybe 2,000 people, the distribution system in that town could not operate properly without the rural area and the rural area cannot carry on properly an electric distribution system without the town. So in such cases the Comptroller General says it is permissible under the law to consolidate the system of the small town with the cooperative in the unserved rural area and thereby bring service to the unserved rural persons. I can see no objection to it.

I think the Rural Electrification Administration has done a wonderful service for the agricultural population of this country, and I do not believe we ought to throw any monkey wrench into the machinery here which would interfere with the orderly operations of that organization. I realize it is under investigation now by a committee of the other body. Perhaps there may be some things about the way in which its business has been conducted which are subject to criticism. But if there are, they should be corrected legislatively and not through consideration of an amendment which none of us heard read until a few moments ago, an amendment to an appropriation bill. We had on March 7, in this House, H. R. 4278, which contains specific provisions with reference to rural electrification, and any Member who wanted to do so could have, at that time, risen on the floor and offered this amendment or any other amendment to the Rural Electrification Act. No amendment was offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma or anybody else.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BOREN. Did not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] at that time say that committee had unanimously refused to insert into that law a provision to permit the purchase of urban areas?

Mr. TARVER. Whether they refused or not, you had the right to offer an amendment, even the same amendment which was offered today. Our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations refused, after your insistence before our committee, to insert this provision, yet you are coming and offering it today. If you think you could not have offered the amendment to the bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] because the committee had unanimously refused to insert it at that time, I wonder why the gentleman does not apply the same argument to offering it to this bill.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] misunderstands me.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry.

Mr. BOREN. They unanimously refused to put into the bill a proposal by the R. E. A. to permit the R. E. A. to buy in towns in excess of 1,500.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the R. E. A. has been following a practice under the construction of the law by the Comptroller General. The gentleman wants to change the law. If his amendment provided nothing but existing law there would be no necessity whatsoever for offering it. The Comptroller General has ruled under existing law it is permissible to make these incidental purchases where it is necessary in setting up rural electrification, and until the law as construed by him is changed it can go ahead and do that. The gentleman wants to change the law. But I say it he wants to change the law he should undertake to do it legislatively and not by an ill-considered provision to be attached to this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 65, line 18, after the end of the bracket, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 70, noes 57.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 171, nays 135, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—171

Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Brehm
Andersen, H. Carl	Barrett	Brown, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Buffett
Andrews, N. Y.	Bender	Burdick
Angell	Bennett, Mich.	Canfield
Arends	Bennett, Mo.	Carlson, Kans.
Arnold	Bishop	Carrier
	Bolton	Carson, Ohio

Carter
Case
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Costello
Crawford
Crosser
Cunningham
Curtis
Day
Dewey
Dirksen
Dondero
Dworshak
Elliott
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Elston, Ohio
Engle, Calif.
Fellows
Fenton
Fish
Gale
Gavin
Gearhart
Gilchrist
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gwynne
Hagen
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Halleck
Hancock
Heidinger
Herter
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson,
Anton J.
Johnson,
Calvin D.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson,
J. Leroy
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Keefe
Kinzer
Knutson
Kunkel
LaFollette
Landis
Lea
LeCompte
Lemke
Lewis
Luce
Ludlow
McConnell
McGregor
McLean
McWilliams
Mansfield,
Mont.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Mo.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Monkiewicz
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Norman
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara
O'Konski
Pittenger
Ploeser
Plumley
Poulson
Powers
Ramey
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rizley
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowe
Sauthoff
Schwabe
Scrivner
Shafer
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sumner, Ill.
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tibbott
Tolan
Welch
West
Wigglesworth
Willey
Wilson
Wolcott
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—135

Abernethy
Allen, La.
Anderson,
N. Mex.
Andrews, Ala.
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bell
Bland
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Burch, Va.
Burgin
Camp
Cannon, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.
Chapman
Clark
Cochran
Coffee
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
D'Alesandro
Davis
Dawson
Delaney
Dies
Dilweg
Durham
Eberharter
Fisher
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Folger
Forand
Ford
Fulbright
Gathings
Gibson
Gordon
Gorski
Gossett
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hare
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Hays
Hébert
Hendricks
Hobbs
Hoch
Holifield
Izac
Jackson
Jarman
Johnson,
Luther A.
Johnson,
Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
Kefauver
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Lanham
Lesinski
McCord
McKenzie
McMillan
McMurray
Magnuson
Mahon
Maloney
Mansfield, Tex.
Marcantonio
Mills
Morrison, La.
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Newsome
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neal
Outland
Pace
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Poage
Priest
Ramspeck
Richards
Rivers
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Rowan
Sasscer
Sheppard
Slaughter
Smith, W. Va.
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Stewart
Sullivan
Sumners, Tex.
Tarver
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Vincent, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Wasielewski
Weaver
Wene
Whelchel, Ga.
White
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Winstead
Woodrum, Va.
Worley
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—122

Andresen,
August H.
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barry
Beall
Blackney
Bloom
Bradley, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.
Brumbaugh
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Burchill, N. Y.
Busbey
Butler
Byrne
Capozzoli
Celler
Chenoweth
Compton
Curley
Dickstein
Dingell
Disney
Domengeaux
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elmer
Engel, Mich.
Fay
Feighan
Fernandez
Fogarty
Fuller
Fulmer
Furlong
Gallagher
Gamble
Gerlach
Gifford
Gore
Green
Gross
Hall,
Leonard W.
Harless, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Hart
Hartley
Heffernan
Holmes, Mass.
Howell
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilburn
Kleberg
Klein
Lambertson
Lane
Larcade
LeFevre
Lynch
McCormack
McCowen
McGehee
Maas
Madden
Manasco
May
Merritt
Merrow
Monroney
Morrison, N. C.
Murphy
Myers
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Connor
O'Toole
Pfeifer
Philbin
Phillips
Pracht,
C. Frederick
Pratt,
Joseph M.
Price
Rabaut
Randolph
Rankin
Rogers, Calif.
Russell
Sabath
Sadowski
Satterfield
Scanlon
Schiffler
Scott
Sheridan
Short
Sikes
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Starnes, Ala.
Sundstrom
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Torrens
Towe
Treadway
Troutman
Vinson, Ga.
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Ward
Weichel, Ohio
Weiss
Winter
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wright

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Randolph against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Byrne against.

Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Baldwin of Maryland against.

Mr. Troutman for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Manasco against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Weichel of Ohio for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. C. Frederick Pracht for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Vorys of Ohio for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Joseph M. Pratt for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Lane against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Gross for, with Mr. Dickstein against.

Mr. Compton for, with Mr. Furlong against.

Mr. Brumbaugh for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Easton for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Torrens against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Lambertson for, with Mr. Starnes of Alabama against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Wright against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. McCowen.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Ward with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Maas.

Mr. May with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Butler.

Mr. BOREN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN GREAT LAKES VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs BLAND, RAMSPECK, MANSFIELD of Texas, WELCH, and O'BRIEN of New York.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF FURTHER REGULATING INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN TOBACCO

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 234, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, after line 11, insert:

"*Resolved*, That Public Law 118, 78th Congress, approved July 7, 1943, is amended by striking out the words "marketing year

with the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74), as amended."

Page 8, line 22, after the words "outplant facilities" and before the period, insert the following proviso: ": *Provided further*, That the limitation of $40,000,000 contained in Public Law 150, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 15, 1943, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $65,000,000.'

Page 69, after line 15, and before the heading "Title III—Judgments and Authorized claims," insert the following new section:

"SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay to regular, full-time civilian officers and employees, whose basic compensation is determined on a daily or hourly basis, overtime compensation, pursuant to the joint resolution of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1068), and the act of May 7, 1943 (Public, No. 49, 78th Cong.), on any basis other than at the rate of one and one-half times the basic rate of payment for work actually performed by such officers and employees in excess of 40 hours per week, without proration or the use of any formula which has been adopted to determine the daily compensation of per annum officers and employees; it being declared to be and to have been the true intent and meaning of the aforesaid enactments to provide for the payment of the overtime compensation of such employees only upon the basis herein described: *Provided*, That any overtime compensation in excess of the compensation so authorized under the above joint resolution and act which has been paid in reliance upon, and in accordance with, any decision or decisions of the Comptroller General is hereby approved and the Comptroller General shall allow credit therefor in the accounts of the officers accountable therefor, and shall make no charges against any certifying officer because of certification of such excess overtime compensation."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4346, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1944.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2778. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 773);

H. R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker; without amendment (Rept. No. 774); and

H. R. 3862. A bill to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 775).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

H. R. 2616. A bill to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 777).

By Mr. GUFFEY (for Mr. SCRUGHAM), from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. 1479. A bill providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites; with amendments (Rept. No. 778).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1770. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 779).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 24, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter J. LaBuy, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice William H. Holly, retired; and

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

REPORT OF NOMINATION OF CLAUDE P. STEPHENS

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably the nomination of Claude P. Stephens, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John T. Metcalf, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be received as in executive session and placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1814. A bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. CLARK of Missouri introduced Senate bill 1815, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1816. A bill granting a pension to Teresa F. Boyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1817. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1818. A bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1819. A bill to repeal the acts of August 15, 1935, and January 29, 1940, relating to the establishment of the Patrick Henry National Monument and the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry, in Charlotte County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1820. A bill to provide for Federal assistance in the maintenance, expansion, and operation of school-lunch and school-milk programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for the distribution of surplus war materials through domestic lend-lease to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof.

Mr. President, in connection with the introduction of the bill, I desire to say that the United States has been more prodigal than any other nation in the history of the world in its lavish generosity to other nations. Both by lend-lease and by U. N. R. R. A. we are holding ourselves out as outfitters and providers for the world. I am introducing today a bill for what might be called domestic lend-lease in order that the hard-pressed American taxpayer may get some of the benefits of the lush expenditures which have been made from his funds. When this war is over we will have on hand a huge stock of material, particularly heavy machinery. I see no reason why the principle of lend-lease should not be applied to this material and why it should not be loaned or leased to counties, towns, road districts, levee districts, soil-conservation districts, or other public subdivisions where it would certainly be of value. In the same way hospital units which have been set up in so many camps and which are not suitable for use by the Veterans' Administration after the war might well be loaned or leased or given to some of the many counties or communities in the United States which are not only too poor to have a hospital but even a medical center.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1815) to provide for distribution of surplus war materials through domestic lend-lease to States and their political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3592. An act to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4099. An act to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4443. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BONE, and Mr. TYDINGS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were severally referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Vice President of the United States on Greek independence day, at Boston, Mass., March 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OMNIBUS G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS FOR RETURNING VETERANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator CLARK of Missouri on the so-called Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

[Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GUFFEY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on the occasion of the Greek independence day celebration, in Washington, D. C., on March 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

"BACK THE INVASION" RALLY ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a "Back the Invasion" rally address delivered by Senator TUNNELL at Baltimore, Md., March 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ONE-HOUSE LEGISLATURE—ARTICLE BY FORMER SENATOR NORRIS

[Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GUFFEY) asked and obtained leave to have reprinted in the RECORD an article entitled "The One-House Legislature," written by former Senator Norris of Nebraska and published in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for September, 1935, and originally printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 13, 1941 (p. A4913), which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITY IN THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article, originally printed as an advertisement, under the heading "When duty whispers low 'thou must!'," which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS BY WENDELL WILLKIE—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What He Really Said," written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Preventable Loss," written by Fred W. Perkins, and published in the Washington Daily News of March 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Light Is Needed," published in the March 25 issue of the Philadelphia Enquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Does the United States Really Have a Foreign Policy?" from the New York Sun of March 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JESSE COTTRELL

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Jesse Cottrell, published in the Greenville (S. C.) News, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALMOS W. GLASGOW

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 555) for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow, which were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$2,800" and insert "$2,300"; and on the same page, line 10, to strike out "1942" and insert "1941."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

OIL COMPANIES AND PIPE-LINE FACILITIES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, during the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses the late lamented Senator Borah, of Idaho, and I introduced certain legislative proposals looking to the divorcement of the functions of integrated oil companies from the profits of the pipe-line owners. I did not renew the proposals in the present Congress, because I was led to believe that certain civil suits instituted by the Department of Justice had accomplished the end of denying the profits accruing by way of the operation of these facilities.

Under date of February 7, 1944, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General, and received a reply from him under date of February 22, 1944, from which I shall read one paragraph.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will not the Senator please read it all? I am very much interested in the subject.

Mr. GILLETTE. I intend to put both letters in the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. The matter is of such great importance that I should like to have the Senator read his letter and the reply.

Mr. GILLETTE. My letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIDDLE: As you know, up through the Seventy-seventh Congress I sponsored legislation proposing a divorcement of the functions of the integrated oil companies with particular emphasis on divorcement of pipe lines from their shipper-owners.

I did not renew my proposals in the present Congress, because I was led to believe that certain civil suits instituted by your department had accomplished the end of denying profits in transportation of oil by pipe lines to their shipper-owners.

With a view to what may happen in the post-war era as to the established pipe lines and those built for war purposes, and to determine whether legislation supplemental to the Antitrust, Interstate Commerce, and the Elkins Acts, is necessary, will you be kind enough to advise me as to whether I have been correctly assured that the litigation removed the rebating practices? In other words has the consent decree been obeyed and has it brought about a reduction in pipe-line tariffs and the discontinuance of the payment of transportation profits to the integrated oil companies?

Also, can you advise me whether the steps taken thus far by your department have resulted in the use of pipe-line facilities by others than their integrated owners?

Sincerely.

The letter was signed by me. The reply of the Attorney General, dated February 22, 1944, is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1944.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: In further reply to your letter of February 7, 1944, inquiring as to the effect of oil pipe-line litigation upon the earnings, tariffs, and use of pipe lines, Assistant Attorney General Berge has informed me that litigation has been instituted under the Antitrust and Elkins Acts. The antitrust case, *United States* v. *American Petroleum Institute et al.*, has been continued until the termination of the war. The Elkins Act cases were consolidated and a consent judgment was entered on December 23, 1941, in *United States* v. *The Atlantic Refining Company et al.*

At this point I interpolate to say that the consent decree was in settlement of a suit filed for the recovery of a billion and a half dollars assessed as penalties for violation of a Federal statute, but a consent decree was filed.

Mr. LANGER. How much of the billion and a half dollars did the Government obtain?

Mr. GILLETTE. As I recall the consent decree, the Government waived its claim to approximately a billion and a half dollars in penalties, and obtained the assurance that the companies would go and sin no more.

Mr. LANGER. That is, the pipe-line companies kept a billion and a half dollars?

Mr. GILLETTE. They have it as yet. The Government did not get any of it.

Mr. LANGER. And the lawsuits are over?

Mr GILLETTE. That lawsuit is over. I read further from the letter of the Attorney General:

The consent judgment, *United States* v. *The Atlantic Refining Co.*, provides that a defendant pipe-line carrier shall not pay to its shipper-owner any part of earnings from transportation in excess of the owner's share of 7 percent of valuation which is defined in the judgment. All earnings in excess of the 7 percent are required to be held in a special surplus account which can be used

Fiat 2.

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 28 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 7), 1944

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, namely:

1 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act
5 referred to as the Secretary, and other personal services in
6 the Office of the Secretary in the District of Columbia,
7 and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the
8 purchase of one and the maintenance, repair, and operation
9 of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel
10 expenses, including examination of estimates for appropri-
11 ations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equip-
12 ment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising,
13 communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs
14 and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and ex-
15 penses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the
16 practical and efficient work of the Department, which are
17 authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate,
18 $1,700,000, together with such amounts from other appro-
19 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
20 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such services
21 and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof
22 as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a
23 total of $187,390, shall be transferred to and made a part of
24 this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total
25 amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

1 year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts
2 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
3 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
4 appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
5 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
6 thereon with representatives of the Department of Agricul-
7 ture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department,
8 shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as
9 changed by such reductions or increases in such appro-
10 priations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the
11 Secretary is authorized to contract for stenographic re-
12 porting services, and the appropriations made in this Act
13 shall be available for such purposes, and to expend from
14 appropriations available for the purchase of lands not to
15 exceed $1 for each option to purchase any particular
16 tract or tracts of land: *Provided further,* That with the
17 approval of the Secretary, employees of the Department
18 stationed abroad may enter into leases for official quar-
19 ters, for periods not exceeding one year, and may pay
20 rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other
21 charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the dis-
22 charge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country
23 where custom or practice requires payment in advance:
24 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by
25 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or

1 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
2 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
3 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
4 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to dam-
5 age threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to
6 future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided fur-*
7 *ther*, That, except to provide materials required in or incident
8 to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
9 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by
10 this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manu-
11 factured from commodities or materials produced outside of
12 the United States.

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor includ-
15 ing personal services in the District of Columbia and else-
16 where, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodi-
17 cals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries
18 by attorneys in the field service, $1,830,632, together with
19 such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as
20 are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal
21 year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or
22 portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary,
23 not exceeding a total of $340,000, shall be transferred to
24 and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be
25 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia

not to exceed $1,015,000: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred thereform to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $506,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $251,179, shall be transferred to and made a part

1 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts
2 not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes
3 enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District
4 of Columbia, $587,955; for preparation and display of
5 exhibits, $46,625 and the preparation, distribution, and dis-
6 play of motion and sound pictures, $59,500, including co-
7 operation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other
8 agencies: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
9 of the appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal
10 year 1945 from which transfers to this appropriation
11 are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below
12 the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget
13 for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred
14 therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which
15 may be expended for personal services in the District of
16 Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
17 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
18 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall
19 determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed
20 by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or
21 authorizations: *Provided further,* That when and to the
22 extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural
23 exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the
24 authorized programs of the various agencies of the Depart-
25 ment can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or

1 distributed by the Office of Information, as the central
2 agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not
3 exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred
4 to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds
5 applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified
6 herein, including personal services in the District of Colum-
7 bia: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion
8 pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a
9 total of $10,000 may be used for the temporary employment,
10 by contract or otherwise, of specialists, technicians, and
11 experts, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as
12 amended: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall
13 be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or
14 State field offices or for the compensation of employees in
15 such offices except that not to exceed $13,900 may be used
16 to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

17 PRINTING AND BINDING

18 For all printing and binding for the Department, in-
19 cluding all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services
20 located in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere,
21 except as otherwise in the Act provided, $1,100,000, includ-
22 ing the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
23 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of
24 the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
25 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915

1 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108),
2 and in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
3 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
4 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
5 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
6 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or
7 sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Sena-
8 tors, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they
9 shall direct, but not including work done at the field print-
10 ing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint
11 Committee on Printing, in accordance with the Act ap-
12 proved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided,*
13 That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from
14 the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agri-
15 cultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary
16 for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas
17 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from
18 funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section
19 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as
20 amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and
21 binding in connection with the activities under said section
22 32, and from funds appropriated for "Salaries and expenses,
23 War Food Administration", such sums as may be necessary
24 for printing and binding in connection with functions as-
25 signed to the Office of Information by the War Food Admin-

1 istrator: *Provided further,* That the total amount that may
2 be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding
3 proviso shall not exceed $385,000.

4 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 Salaries and expenses: For purchase and exchange of
6 reference books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books,
7 periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imper-
8 fect series; not to exceed $1,200 for newspapers; for dues,
9 when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership
10 in societies or associations which issue publications to mem-
11 bers only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers
12 who are not members; for salaries in the city of Washing-
13 ton and elsewhere; for official travel expenses, and for library
14 fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary
15 expenses, $543,233, together with such amounts from other
16 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
17 schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such
18 salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions
19 thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceed-
20 ing a total of $750, shall be transferred to and made a part
21 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation not to
22 exceed $369,070, may be expended for personal services in
23 the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That if the total
24 amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to make copies of bibliographies prepared by the Department library, microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books and other library materials in the Department and sell such bibliographies and reproductions at such prices (not less than estimated cost of furnishing same) as he may determine, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in cooperation with public agencies or organizations, including not to exceed $2,150,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase

1 of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as
2 follows:

3 Economic investigations: For acquiring and diffusing
4 useful information among the people of the United States, for
5 conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations,
6 and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities
7 of the Department, relative to agricultural production, dis-
8 tribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest
9 aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization
10 of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm
11 population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance
12 and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand
13 for the different farm and food products; land ownership
14 and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to
15 agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends,
16 $2,325,236, together with such amounts from other appro-
17 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
18 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and
19 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
20 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
21 $245,377 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
22 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
23 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
24 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts

1 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
2 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this ap-
3 propriation and the amount which may be expended for per-
4 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or
5 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of
6 the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
7 the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
8 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in
9 such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,*
10 That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made
11 available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be
12 used for State and county land-use planning.

13 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
14 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
15 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and
16 livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
17 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
18 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooper-
19 ation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State,
20 and local agencies, and for the collection and publication of
21 statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June
22 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
23 $1,500,000, together with such amounts from other appro-

1 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
2 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and
3 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
4 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
5 $175,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this
6 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
7 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
8 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts esti-
9 mated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
10 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
11 appropriation and the amount which may be expended for
12 personal services in the District of Columbia shall be in-
13 creased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the
14 Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with repre-
15 sentatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate
16 to the requirements as changed by such reductions or in-
17 creases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided*
18 *further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be
19 available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating,
20 or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
21 acreage to be planted in cotton: *Provided further,* That esti-
22 mates of apple production shall be confined to the commercial
23 crop.

1 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
2 RELATIONS

3 Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the functions
4 of the Secretary under the Act of June 5, 1930, as amended
5 (7 U. S. C. 541–545), independently and in cooperation
6 with other branches of the Government, State agencies, pur-
7 chasing and consuming organizations and persons engaged in
8 the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution
9 of farm and food products, and for enabling the Secretary
10 to discharge his functions as a member of the joint Great
11 Britain-United States board known as the Combined Food
12 Board, including the employment of persons and means in
13 the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase of
14 such books and periodicals and not to exceed $500 for news-
15 papers as may be necessary in connection with this work,
16 $481,505.

17 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
18 COMMITTEES

19 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
20 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
21 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
22 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
23 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
24 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
25 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-

1 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
2 thereto.

3 EXTENSION SERVICE

4 PAYMENTS TO STATES; HAWAII; ALASKA; AND PUERTO RICO

5 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
6 Puerto Rico for cooperative agricultural extension work as
7 follows:

8 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
9 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
10 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
11 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935
12 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; additional extension
13 work, the Act approved April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 589),
14 $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929
15 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-
16 Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3
17 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),
18 extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the
19 Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950;
20 Puerto Rico, the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
21 343f–343g) extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bank-
22 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $140,000; in all, Capper-
23 Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $14,198,950.

24 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

25 Administration and coordination of extension work: For

1 the employment of persons and means in the District of
2 Columbia and elsewhere to enable the Secretary to adminis-
3 ter the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8,
4 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or sup-
5 plementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work
6 of the Department and the several States, Territories, and
7 insular possessions, including cooperation with other bureaus
8 and offices of the Department, and Federal, State, county,
9 and other agencies, in the development, preparation, and
10 distribution of educational material designed to increase the
11 effectiveness of cooperative extension work as conducted by
12 the Department in cooperation with land-grant colleges,
13 $748,843, of which amount not to exceed $632,610 may be
14 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

15 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

16 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and ex-
18 penses of the Office of Administrator, and personal services
19 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

20 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

21 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
22 provisions of an Act entitled "An Act to provide for research
23 into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to
24 provide for the further development of cooperative agricul-
25 tural extension work and the more complete endowment and

1 support of land-grant colleges", approved June 29, 1935
2 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f) ; for administration of
3 the provisions of section 5 of the said Act, and for special
4 research work, including the planning, programing, co-
5 ordination, and printing the results of such research, to be
6 conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secre-
7 tary may designate or establish, and to which he may make
8 allotments from this fund, including the employment of
9 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
10 $1,226,364, of which amount $742,315 shall be available
11 for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories
12 and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for
13 by section 4 of said Act.

14 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

15 PAYMENT TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

16 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
17 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect
18 the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
19 experiment stations:

20 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
21 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
22 C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
23 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
24 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,463,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $22,500; in all, for Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,001,208: *Provided*, That in order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population, $63,708 of the appropriation in this paragraph under the Bankhead-Jones Act shall be available for allotment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For salaries and expenses, including personal

1 services in the District of Columbia, necessary to enable the
2 Secretary to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved
3 March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May
4 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June
5 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–
6 363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration
7 and for the administration of an agricultural experiment sta-
8 tion in Puerto Rico, $176,169, of which not to exceed
9 $166,122 may be expended for personal services in the
10 District of Columbia; and the Secretary shall prescribe the
11 form of the annual financial statement required under
12 the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are
13 in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the re-
14 search work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment
15 stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research
16 of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon
17 to Congress.

18 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: To enable
19 the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural
20 experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation,
21 illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and
22 not to exceed $8,000 for the erection and alteration of
23 buildings, $107,074; and the Secretary is authorized to
24 sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to
25 the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and

1 the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered
2 into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
3 receipts.

4 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For the employment of persons and means in the District
7 of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
8 $712,955 for departmental personal services in the
9 District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions
10 of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
11 Industry, and related Acts; and the Secretary, upon applica-
12 tion of any exporter, importer, packer, or owner of, or the
13 agent thereof, or dealer in, livestock, hides, skins, meat, or
14 other animal products, may in his discretion, make inspec-
15 tions and examinations at places other than the headquarters
16 of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge
17 the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence in-
18 curred for such inspections and examinations, the funds
19 derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury
20 of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from
21 which the expenses are paid; collect and disseminate infor-
22 mation concerning livestock and animal products; prepare
23 and disseminate reports on animal industry; purchase in the
24 open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins,
25 or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture,

1 which are sold in the United States, for the detection, pre-
2 vention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals,
3 test the same, and disseminate the results of said tests in
4 such manner as he may deem best, and purchase and destroy
5 diseased or exposed animals, including poultry, or quarantine
6 the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the
7 spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, contagious poultry
8 diseases, or other diseases of animals from one State to
9 another, as follows:

10 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
11 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
12 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
13 District of Columbia, $195,379.

14 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
15 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
16 breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural
17 experiment stations and other agencies, including repairs
18 and additions to and erection of buildings necessary to carry
19 on the experiments (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection
20 or alteration of any one building), $899,500.

21 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
22 diseases of animals, including the alteration and construction
23 of necessary buildings, at Beltsville, Maryland (not to exceed
24 $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one building),
25 and necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculin,

1 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $756,939: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That fees shall be charged for all diagnoses in con-
3 nection with rabies, except those performed for agencies of
4 the United States Government, in such amounts as the
5 Secretary shall prescribe, and such fees shall be covered
6 into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

7 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
8 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
9 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
10 disease of cattle, $5,240,355, together with not to exceed
11 $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation
12 for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided,* That in carrying out
13 the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Sec-
14 retary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tuberc-
15 lous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test
16 for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed,
17 condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his dis-
18 cretion. and in accordance with such rules and regulations
19 as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or
20 elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary
21 for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals
22 but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money
23 hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners
24 of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary
25 to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or

1 municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take
2 place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as com-
3 pensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time
4 of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof,
5 it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm,
6 or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
7 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further,* That
8 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compen-
9 sation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed
10 one-third of the difference between the appraised value of
11 such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no pay-
12 ment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid
13 by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the
14 animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any
15 payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal
16 or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

17 Hog-cholera control: For the control and eradication of
18 hog cholera and related swine diseases, by such means as
19 may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation
20 of organizations, and other methods, either independently
21 or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county
22 authorities, $114,288.

23 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
24 tine work, including the eradication of southern cattle ticks,
25 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the inspec-

1 tion of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation
2 of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of
3 the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of
4 imported animals, including the establishment and mainte-
5 nance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, im-
6 provements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspec-
7 tion work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
8 and the mallein testing of animals, $951,253.

9 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
10 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food prod-
11 ucts, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps,
12 and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to
13 public printing, $8,616,759.

14 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
15 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
16 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
17 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product
18 manufactured in the United States and the importation of
19 such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
20 animals, $272,115.

21 Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus
22 and serum: The sum of $37,007 of the appropriation
23 made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjust-
24 ment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made avail-
25 able during the fiscal year for which appropriations are

1 herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive,
2 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–
3 855), entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act, and for other purposes", including the employ-
5 ment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and
6 elsewhere.

7 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
8 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

9 In case of an emergency arising out of the existence
10 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
11 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of ani-
12 mals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the
13 livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city
14 of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of
15 appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to ex-
16 ceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such
17 disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past
18 and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with
19 the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of ma-
20 terials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease,
21 wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like
22 or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has
23 complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided,*
24 That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be

1 tion of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation
2 of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of
3 the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of
4 imported animals, including the establishment and mainte-
5 nance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, im-
6 provements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspec-
7 tion work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
8 and the mallein testing of animals, $951,253.

9 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
10 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food prod-
11 ucts, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps,
12 and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to
13 public printing, $8,616,759.

14 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
15 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
16 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
17 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product
18 manufactured in the United States and the importation of
19 such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
20 animals, $272,115.

21 Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus
22 and serum: The sum of $37,007 of the appropriation
23 made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjust-
24 ment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made avail-
25 able during the fiscal year for which appropriations are

1 herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive,
2 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–
3 855), entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act, and for other purposes", including the employ-
5 ment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and
6 elsewhere.

7 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
8 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

9 In case of an emergency arising out of the existence
10 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
11 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of ani-
12 mals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the
13 livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city
14 of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of
15 appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to ex-
16 ceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such
17 disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past
18 and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with
19 the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of ma-
20 terials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease,
21 wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like
22 or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has
23 complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided,*
24 That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be

1 made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding
2 value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value
3 no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its
4 meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
5 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment
6 by the United States Government for any animals shall not
7 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
8 That the sum of $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the
9 appropriation of $3,500,000 contained in the Second De-
10 ficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1924, approved De-
11 cember 5, 1924, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth
12 disease and other contagious or infectious diseases of animals,
13 is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which
14 appropriations are herein made to enable the Secretary to
15 control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar
16 diseases in poultry.

17 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
19 ing not to exceed $410,345 for personal services in the
20 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in
21 carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924
22 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experi-
23 ments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative
24 investigations of the dairy industry in the various States,
25 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Acts of

1 May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c), 2327 (b)),
2 and August 10, 1912 (26 U. S. C. 2327 (c)), relating
3 to process or renovated butter, and the Act of May 23, 1908
4 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the expor-
5 tation of process or renovated butter, repairs to buildings,
6 and not to exceed $10,000 for the construction or alteration
7 of buildings, $812,958.

8 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL
9 ENGINEERING

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For the investigation of fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton,
12 tobacco, vegetables, grasses, forage, drug, medicinal, poison-
13 ous, fiber, and other plants and plant industries, of soils and
14 soil-plant relationships, and of the application of engineering
15 principles to agriculture, in cooperation with other branches of
16 the Department, the State experiment stations, and practical
17 farmers; for the erection or alteration of necessary farm build-
18 ings and buildings at the National Arboretum: *Provided*, That
19 the cost of any building erected or altered, except head houses
20 connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500; and for the
21 employment of persons and means in the city of Washing-
22 ton and elsewhere required for the investigations, experi-
23 ments, and demonstrations herein authorized, as follows:

24 General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses
25 for general administrative purposes, including the salary of

1 Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District
2 of Columbia, $225,000.

3 Agricultural engineering investigations: For investiga-
4 tions, experiments, and demonstrations involving the appli-
5 cation of engineering principles to agriculture; for investi-
6 gating and reporting upon the different kinds of farm power
7 and appliances; upon farm domestic water supply and sewage
8 disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings
9 and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and
10 storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical
11 farm equipment and rural electrification, upon the engineer-
12 ing problems relating to the processing, transportation, and
13 storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and
14 upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical
15 characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm
16 machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the
17 Act approved April 19, 1930 (7 U. S. C. 424, 425); for
18 giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural and chem-
19 ical engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the
20 results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and dis-
21 tributing bulletins, plans, and reports, $293,639.

22 Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and
23 improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of
24 cereal production and for the study and control of cereal
25 diseases, for the investigation of the cultivation and breed-

1 ing of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax
2 diseases, for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn
3 and methods of broomcorn production, and for determining
4 the distribution of weeds and means for their control,
5 $645,596.

6 Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: For investiga-
7 tion of the production of cotton and other fiber crops, including
8 the improvement by cultural methods, breeding, and selec-
9 tion, fiber yield and quality, cotton soil-fertility, and the
10 control of diseases, $456,702, of which sum not less than
11 $14,700 shall be used for experimenting in Sea Island cotton,
12 including its hybridization with other varieties.

13 Drug and related plants: For the investigation, testing,
14 and improvement of plants yielding drugs, spices, poisons,
15 oils, and related products and byproducts, $70,308.

16 Dry-land agriculture: For the investigation and im-
17 provement of methods of crop production under subhumid,
18 semiarid, or dry-land conditions, $245,000: *Provided*, That
19 no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establish-
20 ment of any new field station.

21 Forage crops and diseases: For the investigation and
22 improvement of forage crops, including grasses, alfalfas,
23 clovers, soybeans, lespedezas, vetches, cowpeas, field peas,
24 and miscellaneous legumes; for the investigation of green-
25 manure crops and cover crops; for investigations looking to

1 the improvement of pastures; and for the investigation of
2 forage-crop diseases and methods of control, $327,837.

3 Forest pathology: For the investigation of diseases of
4 forest and shade trees and forest products, including a study
5 of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi, bacteria,
6 viruses, and other causes of such diseases, for the purpose of
7 developing methods of control and eradication and deter-
8 mining their application, $255,300.

9 Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: For investiga-
10 tion and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of
11 culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activi-
12 ties concerned with the production of fruits, nuts, vegetables,
13 ornamentals, and related plants, for investigation of methods
14 of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing and utilizing these
15 products, and for studies of the physiological and related
16 changes of such products during processes of marketing and
17 while in commerical storage, $1,458,877.

18 Irrigation agriculture: For investigations of crop pro-
19 duction on irrigable lands, the quality of irrigation water
20 and its use by crops, and methods for improving and
21 maintaining the productivity of irrigated soils, $145,000.

22 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and devel-
23 opment of the National Arboretum established under the
24 provisions of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Sec-

1 retary of Agriculture to establish a National Arboretum, and
2 for other purposes", approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
3 191–194), employment of persons and means in the city of
4 Washington and elsewhere, and travel expenses of em-
5 ployees and advisory council, $31,500, of which not to
6 exceed $2,500 may be expended by contract or otherwise
7 for the services of consulting landscape architects without
8 reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or
9 civil-service rules.

10 Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: For
11 investigations in seed and plant introduction, including the
12 study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and dis-
13 tribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs,
14 vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from
15 our possessions, and also wild native plants, for experiments
16 with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this
17 country, for plant-disease investigations, including nema-
18 tology, and for plant and plant-disease collections and
19 surveys, $290,000.

20 Plant Industry Experiment Farm: For the maintenance
21 of a general experiment farm and agricultural station in the
22 vicinity of Beltsville, Maryland, $56,976.

23 Soil and fertilizer investigations: For soil and fertilizer
24 investigations, including soil minerals, soil organic matter, soil

1 solution, soil physical and chemical investigations, soil micro-
2 biology, including the testing of cultures procured in the open
3 market for inoculating legumes, other crops, or soil, and if
4 any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or mis-
5 branded, the results of the tests may be published, together
6 with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by
7 whom the cultures were offered for sale; for investigations
8 of the causes of soil infertility and the maintenance of soil
9 productivity; and for investigations within the United States
10 of fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, including phosphoric acid
11 and potash, and other soil amendments, and their suitability
12 for agricultural use, $346,791.

13 Soil survey: For the investigation of soils and their
14 origin, for survey of the extent of classes and types, and
15 for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise,
16 the results of such investigations and surveys, $162,582.

17 Sugar-plant investigations: For sugar-plant investiga-
18 tions, including studies of diseases and the improvement of
19 sugar beets and sugar-beet seed, sugarcane, and other sugar-
20 producing plants, cultural and production methods, and the
21 improvement and maintenance of soil fertility in relation to
22 sugar plants, $370,000.

23 Tobacco investigations: For the investigation and im-
24 provement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production
25 and handling, $131,020.

1 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses connected with investigations,
4 experiments, and demonstrations for the promotion of eco-
5 nomic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
6 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
7 agriculture, for investigating and importing useful and bene-
8 ficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of in-
9 sects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining
10 the best means of destroying insects affecting man and ani-
11 mals, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
12 visions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as
13 amended (7 U. S. C. 146, 147, 151–167, 281, 282), to
14 conduct other activities hereinafter authorized, and for the
15 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious
16 insects and plant pests, independently or in cooperation with
17 other branches of the Federal Government, States, counties,
18 municipalities, corporations, agencies, individuals, or with
19 foreign governments; including the employment of necessary
20 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
21 of which not to exceed $633,886 may be expended for
22 personal services in the District of Columbia, rent, con-
23 struction, alteration, or repair of necessary buildings outside

1 the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That, unless otherwise
2 specifically provided, the cost for the construction or altera-
3 tion of any building shall not exceed $1,500 and the total
4 amount expended for such construction in any one year shall
5 not exceed $7,000, as follows:

6 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
7 trative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau
8 and other personal services, $160,920.

9 Fruit insects: For insects affecting fruits, grapes, and
10 nuts, $457,230.

11 Japanese beetle control: For the control and preven-
12 tion of spread of the Japanese beetle, $400,000: *Provided,*
13 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the
14 cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

15 Sweetpotato weevil control: For the determination and
16 application of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils
17 as, in the judgment of the Secretary, may be necessary,
18 $78,670: *Provided,* That in the discretion of the Secre-
19 tary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
20 control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State
21 has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this pur-
22 pose: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation
23 shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm
24 crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

25 Mexican fruitfly control: For the control and prevention

1 of spread of the Mexican fruitfly, including necessary surveys
2 and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the
3 Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $169,820.
4 Gypsy and brown-tail moth control: For the control
5 and prevention of spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths,
6 $409,320.
7 Dutch elm disease control: For determining and apply-
8 ing methods of control and prevention of spread of the
9 disease of elm trees known as "Dutch elm disease" and of
10 a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley,
11 $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That, in
12 the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this
13 appropriation shall be made for applying methods of con-
14 trol of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures
15 for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
16 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
17 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential
18 or appropiate for the carrying on of the control program,
19 nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures
20 shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by
21 State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organi-
22 zations concerned: *Provided further*, That expenditures in-
23 curred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not
24 be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions,
25 or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this ap-

1 propriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction
2 of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where
3 such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the
4 Government of the United States, or on property included
5 within local experimental control areas: *Provided further,*
6 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost
7 or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

8 Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication: For deter-
9 mining and applying such methods of eradication, control,
10 and prevention of spread of the diseases of peach trees known
11 as "phony peach" and "peach mosaic" as in the judgment
12 of the Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation
13 with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations
14 of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to
15 accomplish such purposes, including the certification of prod-
16 ucts out of the infested areas to meet the requirements of
17 State quarantines, $99,340: *Provided,* That no part of the
18 money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or
19 value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

20 Forest insects: For insects affecting forests and forest
21 products, under section 4 of the Act approved May 22, 1928
22 (16 U. S. C. 581c), entitled "An Act to insure adequate
23 supplies of timber and other forest products for the people
24 of the United States, to promote the full use for timber grow-
25 ing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States,

1 including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not
2 suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correla-
3 tion and the most economical conduct of forest research in
4 the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforest-
5 ation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest eco-
6 nomics, and related subjects", and for insects affecting orna-
7 mental trees and shrubs, $202,000.

8 Truck crop and garden insects: For insects affecting truck
9 crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco,
10 sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $326,340.

11 Cereal and forage insects: For insects affecting cereal
12 and forage crops, including sugarcane and rice, and including
13 research on the European corn borer, $403,370.

14 Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the com-
15 mon barberry and for applying such other methods of
16 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of cereal
17 rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary
18 to accomplish such purposes, $258,470: *Provided,* That,
19 in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from
20 this appropriation shall be made for these purposes until a
21 sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have
22 been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
23 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
24 tions for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*
25 *further,* That no part of the money herein appropriated

1 shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured
2 or destroyed.

3 Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $163,730.

4 Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the
5 control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil
6 and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such
7 cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any
8 infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations
9 in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or
10 local Mexican authorities, $738,960.

11 Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and
12 the propagation and distribution by sale of surplus bee-breed-
13 ing stock, $91,950: *Provided,* That the rates at which such
14 sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary
15 and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treas-
16 ury as miscellaneous receipts.

17 Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting
18 man, household possessions, and animals, $175,000.

19 Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identifica-
20 tion and classification of insects, including taxonomic, mor-
21 phological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the
22 maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and
23 dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other
24 agencies concerned with insect-pest control, $145,000.

25 Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in con-

1 nection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious
2 insects and related pests and for the exchange with other
3 countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods,
4 $20,000.

5 Control investigations: For developing equipment or
6 apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication
7 and control of plant pests, determining methods of disin-
8 fecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests,
9 determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases
10 of insect-pest control, $76,485, of which not less than
11 $10,000 shall be used for methyl bromide investigations.

12 Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the inves-
13 tigation and development of methods of manufacturing
14 insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical
15 problems relating to the composition, action, and applica-
16 tion of insecticides and fungicides, $130,520.

17 Transit inspection: For the inspection in transit or
18 otherwise of articles quarantined under the Act of August
19 20, 1912 (7 U. S. C. 161, 164a), as amended, and for the
20 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
21 transported interstate in violation of quarantines promulgated
22 thereunder, $45,900.

23 Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign
24 plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export,
25 and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from

1 Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of
2 the entry into the United States of railway cars and other
3 vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials
4 from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection
5 thereof, including construction and repair of necessary build-
6 ings, plants, and equipment, for the fumigation, disinfection,
7 or cleaning of products, railway cars, or other vehicles enter-
8 ing the United States from Mexico, $797,700: *Provided,*
9 That any moneys received in payment of charges fixed by
10 the Secretary on account of such cleaning and disinfection
11 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
12 Certification of exports: For the inspection, under such
13 rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, of
14 domestic plants and plant products when offered for export
15 and to certify to shippers and interested parties as to the
16 freedom of such products from injurious plant diseases and
17 insect pests according to the sanitary requirements of the
18 foreign countries affected and to make such reasonable
19 charges and to use such means as may be necessary to ac-
20 complish this object, $34,480: *Provided,* That moneys
21 received on account of such inspection and certification shall
22 be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
23 CONTROL OF INCIPIENT AND EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF
24 INSECT PESTS AND PLANT DISEASES
25 Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect

1 pests and plant diseases: To enable the Secretary to carry
2 out the provisions of and for expenditures authorized by
3 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
4 148–148e), including surveys and control operations in
5 Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or
6 local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian
7 citizens, $2,700,000.

8 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations
11 hereinafter authorized, independently or in cooperation with
12 other branches of the Department, other departments or
13 agencies of the Federal Government, States, State agricul-
14 tural experiment stations, universities, and other State
15 agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business,
16 farm, or other organizations and corporations, individuals,
17 associations, and scientific societies, including the employ-
18 ment of necessary persons and means in the city of Wash-
19 ington and elsewhere, of which not to exceed $198,280 may
20 be expended for personal services in the District of Colum-
21 bia; and for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings out-
22 side the District of Columbia at a total cost not to exceed
23 $15,000, as follows:

24 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-

1 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
2 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
3 District of Columbia, $82,250.

4 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
5 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
6 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of
7 chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physi-
8 cal, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods,
9 feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances
10 used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the
11 physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of
12 such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and
13 development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar
14 sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural
15 materials for such purposes; for the technological investiga-
16 tion of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen
17 pack investigations; and to cooperate with associations and
18 scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis,
19 $313,411.

20 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
21 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
22 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
23 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
24 stores; the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and
25 utilization of naval stores; and for the assembling and com-

1 pilation of data on production, distribution, and consumption
2 of turpentine and rosin, pursuant to the Act of August 15,
3 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), $112,100.

4 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the
5 researches established under the provisions of section 202
6 (a) to 202 (c), inclusive, of title II, and subject to the
7 provisions of section 393 of title III, of the Agricultural
8 Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292, 1393),
9 including research on food products of farm commodities,
10 $4,244,600.

11 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

12 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
13 ing not to exceed $290,400 for personal services in the
14 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition
15 and Home Economics for conducting either independently
16 or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of
17 the relative utility and economy of agricultural products
18 for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special
19 suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective
20 utilization of such products for these purposes, and such
21 economic investigations, including housing and household
22 buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the
23 rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this
24 subject, $806,630.

1 BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER

2 For general administrative purposes, including main-
3 tenance, operation, construction, or alteration of necessary
4 buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500 for any one build-
5 ing, repairs, and other expenses, $130,760: *Provided*, That
6 the appropriation current at the time services are rendered
7 may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements
8 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
9 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and other
10 related services, for equipment rentals (including depre-
11 ciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
12 equipment and materials furnished, stores of which may
13 be maintained at the Center, and for building construction,
14 alteration, and repair performed by the Center in carrying
15 out the purposes of such applicable appropriations and the
16 applicable appropriations may also be charged their pro-
17 portionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
18 Center not covered by this appropriation.

19 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

20 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
21 out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act for forest pro-
22 tection against the white pine blister rust, approved April
23 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), and in accordance with the
24 provisions thereof, including the employment of persons and
25 means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,264,026;

1 of which amount $203,173 shall be available to the
2 Department of the Interior for control of white pine
3 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the juris-
4 diction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which
5 are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of
6 the United States; $1,219,900 of said amount to the
7 Forest Service for the control of white pine blister
8 rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and
9 $840,953 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology
10 and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordina-
11 tion of the entire program, method development, and
12 for operations conducted under its direction for such con-
13 trol, including, but not confined to, cooperation with
14 individual States, local authorites and private agencies in the
15 control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State
16 and privately owned lands.

17 FOREST SERVICE

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For the employment of persons and means in the Dis-
20 trict of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
21 $887,074 for departmental personal services in the District
22 of Columbia, and to enable the Secretary to experiment
23 and to make and continue investigations and report on for-
24 estry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no
25 part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment

1 or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to
2 advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the
3 same; to investigate and test American timber and timber
4 trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treat-
5 ment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the plant-
6 ing of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the tree-
7 less regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the
8 cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,
9 exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply
10 or sanitary system and of connecting the same with
11 any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower
12 upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not
13 exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected,
14 purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or
15 more, may be improved out of the appropriations made
16 under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to
17 exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified
18 by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the
19 national forests, including tree planting and other measures
20 to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the
21 formation of floods, and to conserve water and including
22 the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary
23 for information leading to the arrest and conviction for
24 violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or
25 near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury

1 to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions
2 upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care
3 for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or
4 the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate
5 the results of experiments and investigations made by the
6 Forest Service; to purchase lawbooks, reference and tech-
7 nical books, and technical journals for officers of the Forest
8 Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical
9 supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the
10 immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees
11 engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service:
12 *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,500 may be
13 expended for the contribution of the United States to the
14 cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Union
15 of Forest Research Stations and of the Department of
16 Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois:
17 *Provided further,* That the appropriations for the work of
18 the Forest Service shall be available for meeting the expenses
19 of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and
20 handling of supplies, equipment, and materials stored therein
21 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Forest
22 Service and for sale and distribution to other Government
23 activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate
24 with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written
25 cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment,

1 and materials, including the cost of supervision, transporta-
2 tion, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appro-
3 priations current at the time additional supplies and materials
4 are procured for warehouse stocks: *Provided further,* That
5 the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service avail-
6 able for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replace-
7 ment of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for
8 use of such equipment on projects of the Forest Service
9 chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other
10 Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reim-
11 bursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the
12 work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief
13 Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation,
14 repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment manage-
15 ment control, and credited to appropriations currently avail-
16 able at the time adjustment is effected: *Provided further,*
17 That the Forest Service may rent equipment for fire-control
18 purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal
19 agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control
20 under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the
21 amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropria-
22 tions currently available at the time payment is received,
23 as follows:
24 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
25 penses for general administrative purposes, including the

1 salary of the Chief Forester, for the necessary expenses of
2 the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized
3 by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
4 514), and for other personal services in the District of
5 Columbia, $625,000.

6 National forest protection and management: For the
7 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
8 and development of the national forests, including the
9 establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries,
10 including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
11 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
12 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
13 maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract
14 or otherwise, with authority to renew any contract for
15 such purpose annually, not more than twice, without addi-
16 tional advertising; the maintenance of roads and trails and
17 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
18 necessary for the proper and economical administration,
19 protection, development, and use of the national forests,
20 including experimental areas under Forest Service administra-
21 tion, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary,
22 direct purchases will be more economical than construction,
23 improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to
24 exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and
25 maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control

1 of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cul-
2 tural operations; development and application of fish
3 and game management plans; propagation and transplant-
4 ing of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions
5 of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber
6 and other resources and development and application
7 of plans for their effective management, sale, and use;
8 acceptance of moneys from timber purchasers for de-
9 posit into the Treasury in the trust account, Forest Service
10 Cooperative Fund, which moneys are hereby appropriated
11 and made available until expended for scaling services
12 requested by purchasers in addition to those required by the
13 Forest Service, and for refunds of amounts deposited in
14 excess of the cost of such work; examination, classification,
15 surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting ex-
16 changes authorized by law and of lands within the
17 boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to
18 homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
19 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
20 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
21 512); investigation and establishment of water rights,
22 including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in
23 lands or rights-of-ways for use and protection of water
24 rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the admin-
25 istration and public use of the national forests; and all

1 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
2 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
3 including lands under contract for purchase or for the
4 acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been
5 instituted under the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
6 521), and the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499,
7 505, 564–570), lands transferred by authority of the Secre-
8 tary from the Resettlement Administration to the Forest
9 Service, and lands transferred to the Forest Service under
10 authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
11 $17,729,426: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be avail-
12 able for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of
13 persons who have lost their lives as a result of fighting fires
14 while employed by the Forest Service: *Provided further*,
15 That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood,
16 and other forest products the amounts made available for
17 schools and roads by the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C.
18 500), and the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501),
19 shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber.
20 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
21 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
22 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
23 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
24 unappropriated public forest lands, $100,000, which amount

1 shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preced-
2 ing fiscal year.

3 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
4 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
5 entitled "An Act to insure adequate supplies of timber and
6 other forest products for the people of the United States,
7 to promote the full use for timber growing and other pur-
8 poses of forest lands in the United States, including farm
9 wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agri-
10 cultural production, and to secure the correlation and the
11 most economical conduct of forest research in the Depart-
12 ment of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber
13 growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related
14 subjects", approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C.
15 581, 581a, 581f–581i), as follows:

16 Forest management: Fire, silvicultural, and other forest
17 investigations and experiments under said section 2, as
18 amended, at forest experiment stations or elsewhere,
19 $498,848.

20 Range investigations: Investigations and experiments to
21 develop improved methods of management of forest and
22 other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment
23 stations or elsewhere, $288,475.

24 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests

1 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
2 Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,092,519.

3 Forest survey: A comprehensive forest survey under
4 section 9, $156,246.

5 Forest economics: Investigations in forest economics
6 under section 10, $74,018.

7 Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at
8 forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and
9 demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover char-
10 acteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water
11 conservation, flood control, stream-flow regulation, erosion,
12 climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for de-
13 veloping preventive and control measures therefor, $86,762.

14 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

15 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
16 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
17 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
18 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act en-
19 titled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for
20 the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of
21 national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote
22 the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable
23 therefor", approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C.
24 564–570), $2,500,000, and in addition thereto $29,062 to
25 carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of

1943; in all, $2,529,062, of which not to exceed $64,226 and $5,000 shall be available for personal services and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively, in the District of Columbia.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $532,038) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,728), of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance

1 of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not
2 to exceed $781,466, of which not to exceed $50,958 may
3 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia;
4 the purchase of reference books and technical journals;
5 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or
6 purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
7 *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation which is avail-
8 able for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and
9 sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924,
10 shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the
11 State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or in-
12 dividuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that
13 to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make
14 contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to
15 be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further,* That any
16 part of this appropriation allocated for the production or
17 procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds
18 appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to co-
19 operating States for the production or procurement of nursery
20 stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more
21 than three fiscal years: *Provided further,* That in carrying
22 into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry
23 Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish
24 new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such
25 new nurseries.

1 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

2 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
3 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
4 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, of which not to exceed
5 $20,030 may be expended for personal services in the Dis-
6 trict of Columbia.

7 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

8 For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the
9 Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23
10 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and
11 maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under
12 Forest Service administration, including not to exceed
13 $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
14 $4,161,496 for forest development roads and trails, to be
15 immediately available and to remain available until expended:
16 *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the
17 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
18 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and sup-
19 plies used for road and trail construction and maintenance,
20 but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered,
21 or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed
22 $7,500.

23 EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

24 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
25 carry into effect the Act of March 5, 1942, as amended

1 (7 U. S. C. 171–175), including personal services in the
2 District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding
3 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and
5 periodicals; purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; erection
6 of necessary buildings; procurement of medical supplies or
7 services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance
8 of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, and furnish-
9 ing to employees daily transportation between points of
10 assembly and work projects, including the cost of progres-
11 sive and final liquidation of all of said project during the
12 fiscal year 1945, there is hereby continued available, in
13 accordance with section 3 of said Act of March 5, 1942,
14 not to exceed $3,952,585 of the unobligated balances of
15 appropriations made under this head for the fiscal years
16 1942 and 1943, which balances shall be merged with the
17 appropriation made under this head in the Department of
18 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided,* That any
19 proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from
20 guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales,
21 rentals, and fees resulting from operations under such Act
22 of March 5, 1942, as amended, shall be covered into the
23 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

24 WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

25 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable

1 the War Food Administration to perform its functions, in-
2 cluding those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310,
3 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by
4 transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private
5 agencies and individuals, other personal services in the
6 District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with
7 the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and com-
8 pensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjust-
9 ment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the tem-
10 porary employment of persons or organizations by contract
11 or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of
12 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary
13 expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of sub-
14 sistence, of persons serving while away from their perma-
15 nent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by
16 the War Food Administration, without other compensation
17 from the United States, except that such expenditures shall
18 not exceed $200,000; printing and binding; the purchase of
19 lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed
20 $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and
21 maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia)
22 of passenger-carrying vehicles; $29,200,000: *Provided,*
23 That the applicable appropriations available to the War
24 Food Administration, current at the time services are ren-
25 dered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed

1 by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by
2 advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or esti-
3 mated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration,
4 incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such non-
5 governmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided*
6 *further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall
7 be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under
8 which assessments are made against producers or handlers
9 of agricultural products for administration of such orders:
10 *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall
11 be used for agricultural wage stabilization.

12 COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

13 Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed
14 $5,458,526 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation
15 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Cor-
16 poration in carrying out its activities as authorized by law,
17 including personal services in the District of Columbia and
18 elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standard-
19 ized Government Travel Regulations and the Act of June 3,
20 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and
21 binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed
22 $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; procurement
23 of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the District
24 of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
25 *Provided,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and

1 special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but
2 not including other personal services) in connection with the
3 acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dis-
4 position of any real or personal property belonging to the
5 Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses
6 of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as
7 nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Pro-*
8 *vided further,* That none of the fund made available by this
9 paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until
10 an appropriate appropriation account shall have been estab-
11 lished therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a
12 covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be ac-
13 counted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and
14 Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further,*
15 That none of the fund made available by this paragraph
16 shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the
17 sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks
18 of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by
19 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable
20 price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1,
21 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-8) : *Provided further,*
22 That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other dis-
23 position of any agricultural commodity substantially deterio-
24 rated in quality or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the

1 extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for
2 seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further,* That no
3 wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the
4 parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided*
5 *further,* That in making regional adjustments in the sale
6 price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher
7 in any area than the United States average parity price of
8 corn.

9 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL
10 LAND RESOURCES

11 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
12 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclu-
13 sive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act,
14 approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C.
15 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjust-
16 ment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407)
17 (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and
18 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including per-
19 sonal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not
20 to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of ex-
21 hibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and inter-
22 national fairs within the United States; purchase of law-
23 books, books of reference, periodicals, $290,000,000, to
24 remain available until December 31, 1945, for compliance

1 with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural
2 Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of Feb-
3 ruary 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of
4 the 1944 programs carried out during the period July 1,
5 1943, to December 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided,* That
6 no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation
7 in this Act shall be used for incentive or production ad-
8 justment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-
9 conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment
10 commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricul-
11 tural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enu-
12 merated and set forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conserva-
13 tion Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided*
14 *further,* That not to exceed $24,250,000 of said amount shall
15 be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other ad-
16 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not
17 more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the
18 schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the
19 appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricul-
20 tural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred: *Provided*
21 *further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or
22 made available for the functions assigned to the Agricul-
23 tural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
24 (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
25 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information

1 employees or any State or county information employees,
2 but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or sup-
3 plying of information to individual farmers: *Provided fur-*
4 *ther,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and
5 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-
6 lation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-build-
7 ing practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under
8 the Act of February 29, 1936, and like programs under the
9 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total
10 expenditures of which, including administration, shall not
11 exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, ferti-
12 lizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand
13 at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants
14 under the 1945 program; but the payments or grants under
15 such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of
16 land with respect to which such payments or grants are
17 to be made, in conformity with farming practices which
18 will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-
19 water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective
20 manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as
21 determined and approved by the State Committee of the
22 Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States:
23 *Provided further,* That no part of such amounts shall
24 be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and
25 other administrative expenses except for payment of ob-

1 ligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Pro-*
2 *vided further,* That the Secretary may, in his discretion,
3 from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office
4 such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative ex-
5 penses of the General Accounting Office in auditing pay-
6 ments under this item: *Provided further,* That such amount
7 shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime,
8 trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing
9 services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers
10 to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by
11 the Secretary in the 1944 and 1945 programs under said
12 Act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimburse-
13 ment of any Federal, State, or local government agency
14 for such materials, or services, and for the payment of all
15 expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or
16 part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided*
17 *further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law,
18 persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as
19 tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United
20 States Government and who comply with the terms and condi-
21 tions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, form-
22 ulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said Act
23 of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and
24 receive payments for their participation in said program to
25 the same extent as other producers: *Provided further,* That

1 no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the
2 Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau
3 or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used
4 to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages
5 in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but
6 not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign
7 funds of political parties or to any organization, association,
8 corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or in-
9 fluencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political
10 office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or
11 contributions for the distribution of publications and other
12 literature designed to influence or aid in the election or
13 defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in
14 activities designed to influence the action of Congress with
15 respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except
16 that employees may furnish to Congress any information
17 authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by
18 Congress, or by any of its committees or members) : *Pro-*
19 *vided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this
20 bill shall be paid out for the salary per diem allowance or
21 expenses of any person, who personally or by letter de-
22 mands that a farmer join the triple A program as a
23 condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority
24 certificate for any rationed article or commodity.

1 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

2 Administrative and operating expenses: For operating
3 and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insur-
4 ance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7
5 U. S. C. 1501–1518), including the employment of persons
6 and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, print-
7 ing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference,
8 and periodicals, there is hereby reappropriated not to exceed
9 $100,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation
10 made for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30,
11 1944: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall
12 be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat
13 and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for
14 any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation
15 of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted
16 prior to July 31, 1943.

17 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

18 To carry out the provisions of an Act entitled "An Act
19 to provide for the protection of land resources against soil
20 erosion, and for other purposes", approved April 27, 1935
21 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national
22 program of erosion control and soil and moisture conserva-
23 tion to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other
24 agencies, including the employment of persons and means
25 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to

1 exceed $1,089,837 may be expended for personal serv-
2 ices in the District of Columbia, purchase of books
3 and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one
4 passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia,
5 furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees,
6 and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent
7 buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased,
8 erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing
9 a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same
10 with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where
11 buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being pur-
12 chased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to
13 be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
14 *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this Act
15 shall be available for the construction of any such building
16 on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*,
17 That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are
18 herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil
19 Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the
20 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,
21 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment
22 stored therein for distribution to projects under the super-
23 vision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and
24 distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such
25 supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (in-

1 cluding the cost of transportation and handling) to be reim-
2 bursed to appropriations current at the time additional
3 supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the
4 appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such
5 supplies, materials, or equipment: *Provided further,* That
6 in any case in which a State has established a central State
7 agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United
8 States or any of its agencies on policies and general pro-
9 grams for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal
10 aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agree-
11 ments made by or on behalf of the United States with any
12 such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval
13 of such central State agency before they shall become effec-
14 tive as to such district, as follows:

15 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
16 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects
17 of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil
18 and moisture conservation (including the construction and
19 hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage); and
20 for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental
21 watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations,
22 $1,225,000.

23 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preven-
24 tive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such
25 special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and

1 the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of
2 farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and
3 operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation
4 plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
5 $28,340,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appro-
6 priation may be expended for soil and water con-
7 servation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided*
8 *further,* That any part of this appropriation allocated for
9 the production or procurement of nursery stock by any
10 Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency
11 for allocation to cooperating States for the production or
12 procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for
13 expenditure for not more than three fiscal years.

14 Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For
15 research and demonstration work in soil conservation
16 control measures, including research and demonstration work
17 in fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate
18 fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $72,248:
19 *Provided,* That no expenditures shall be made for these pur-
20 poses until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall
21 have been made available by the State of Florida, or a
22 political subdivision thereof, for the same purposes.

23 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
24 SUBMARGINAL LAND

25 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
26 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved

1 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), including the em-
2 ployment of persons and means in the District of Columbia
3 and elsewhere, $1,250,000.

4 SUGAR ACT

5 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions,
6 other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands,
7 of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as
8 amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including the employ-
9 ment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and
10 elsewhere, as authorized by said Act, $52,510,203, to remain
11 available until June 30, 1946.

12 MARKETING SERVICE

13 For the employment of such persons and means in the
14 city of Washington and elsewhere (including not to exceed
15 $1,408,617 for departmental personal services in the Dis-
16 trict of Columbia) as may be necessary in conducting in-
17 vestigations, experiments, and demonstrations, either inde-
18 pendently or in cooperation with public or private agencies,
19 organizations, or individuals, as follows:

20 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
21 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely infor-
22 mation on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
23 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
24 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
25 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and

1 their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and
2 other agricultural products, independently and in coopera-
3 tion with other branches of the Government, State agencies,
4 purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons en-
5 gaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and dis-
6 tribution of farm and food products, $1,267,290.

7 Market inspection of farm products: For enabling
8 the Secretary, independently and in cooperation with other
9 branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and
10 consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of com-
11 merce, or other associations of businessmen or trade organiza-
12 tions, and persons or corporations engaged in the production,
13 transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food
14 products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions,
15 to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested
16 parties the class, quality, and condition of cotton, tobacco,
17 fruits, and vegetables, whether raw, dried, canned, or other-
18 wise processed, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm
19 products when offered for interstate shipment or when re-
20 ceived at such important central markets as the Secretary may
21 from time to time designate, or at points which may be con-
22 veniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations
23 as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be
24 reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for
25 the service rendered: *Provided,* That officers and employees

1 who, under proper authorization, use privately owned motor
2 vehicles in the performance of official travel within the
3 corporate limits of their official stations for the purpose of
4 inspecting and grading farm and food products and the
5 supervision thereof at points located within the said cor-
6 porate limits may be reimbursed for such travel at a rate
7 not to exceed 3 cents per mile: *Provided further,* That
8 certificates issued by the authorized agents of the Depart-
9 ment shall be received in all courts of the United States
10 as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein
11 contained, $547,679.

12 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
13 among the people of the United States useful information
14 relative to the standardization, classification, grading, prep-
15 aration for market, handling, and marketing of farm and
16 food products, including the demonstration and promotion
17 of the use of uniform standards of classification of American
18 farm and food products throughout the world, and for making
19 analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7,
20 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), $451,500: *Provided,* That
21 samples, illustrations, practical forms, or sets of the grades
22 recommended or promulgated by the Secretary for farm or
23 food products may be sold under such rules and regulations
24 as he may prescribe, and the receipts therefrom deposited
25 in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

1 Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards
2 Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
3 visions of an Act entitled "An Act to establish and promote
4 the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide
5 and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for
6 other purposes", approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C.
7 511–511q), and an Act entitled "An Act to provide for
8 the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the
9 Department of Agriculture", approved January 14, 1929
10 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, $933,500.

11 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
12 and Standard Container Acts: To enable the Secretary to
13 carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural
14 Commodities Act, approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7
15 U. S. C. 499a–499r), and the Act to prevent the
16 destruction or dumping of farm produce, and for other
17 purposes, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491–
18 497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916,
19 as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the Act to fix stand-
20 ards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets
21 for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes, approved
22 May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $210,000.

23 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts:
24 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of
25 the Act authorizing him to collect and publish statistics of

1 the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3,
2 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
3 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by
4 chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton
5 futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect
6 the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act,
7 approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
8 including such means as may be necessary for effectuating
9 agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and
10 other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the
11 adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton
12 classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes
13 with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution,
14 inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies
15 thereof under such agreements, $1,210,783.

16 United States Grain Standards Act: To enable the
17 Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United
18 States Grain Standards Act, $860,999.

19 United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary
20 to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Ware-
21 house Act, $533,930.

22 Federal Seed Act: To enable the Secretary to carry
23 into effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to
24 regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require
25 labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in inter-

1 state commerce; to require certain standards with respect to
2 certain imported seeds; and for other purposes", approved
3 August 9, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 1561–1610), $117,700: *Pro-*
4 *vided,* That not to exceed $250 of this amount may be used
5 for meeting the share of the United States in the expenses
6 of the International Seed Testing Congress in carrying out
7 plans for correlating the work of the various adhering gov-
8 ernments on problems relating to seed analysis or other
9 subjects which the Congress may determine to be necessary
10 in the interest of international seed trade.

11 Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the pro-
12 visions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
13 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
14 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $418,700.

15 Naval Stores Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry
16 into effect the provisions of the Naval Stores Act of March
17 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 91–99), $34,728.

18 Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry
19 into effect the provisions of the Act of April 26, 1910 (7
20 U. S. C. 121–134), entitled "An Act for preventing the
21 manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or mis-
22 branded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and
23 also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other
24 purposes", $215,208.

1 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary to
2 carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange
3 Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), and as further
4 amended by the Act of October 9, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 2),
5 $348,797.

6 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the
7 provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II
8 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C.
9 1291), $78,762.

10 FARM TENANCY

11 To enable the Secretary through the War Food Admin-
12 istration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the
13 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
14 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

15 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in con-
16 nection with the making of loans under title I of the
17 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
18 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due
19 the United States on account of loans heretofore made under
20 the provisions of said Act, including the employment of
21 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
22 exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said
23 Act, $750,000.

24 Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance
25 with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,

1 approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006),
2 $15,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Re-
3 construction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3
4 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used
5 for making loans under the terms of said Act for the pur-
6 chase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit
7 of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality
8 in which such purchase may be made, which value shall
9 be determined solely according to statistics of the farm
10 census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
11 poration is hereby authorized and directed to lend such
12 sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obliga-
13 tions of borrowers from the Secretary under the pro-
14 visions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
15 Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006):
16 *Provided,* That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction
17 Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the
18 principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting
19 the security therefor: *Provided further,* That the Secretary
20 may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest
21 on any loans made under such title I to repay the Recon-
22 struction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed there-
23 from under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further,*
24 That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such
25 obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

1 is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding
2 at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by
3 an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

4 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

5 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
6 sions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved
7 May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), as
8 follows:

9 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and
10 expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports
11 including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrifica-
12 tion Administration, and other personal services in the Dis-
13 trict of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange
14 of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and
15 periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to
16 exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $2,550,000.

17 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
18 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses
19 incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section
20 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as
21 amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

22 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Admin-
25 istration in the District of Columbia and the field, including

1 printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to
2 exceed $5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority
3 attending meetings or conventions of members of organiza-
4 tions at which matters of importance to the work of the
5 Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or trans-
6 acted; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $750
7 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic
8 reporting services; library membership fees or dues in
9 organizations which issue publications to members only or
10 to members at a lower price than to others, payment for
11 which may be made in advance; not to exceed $10,000 for
12 purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by
13 personal service without regard to the provisions of any
14 other Act; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation
15 of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in the District
16 of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of
17 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
18 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
19 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
20 without other compensation from the United States, in an
21 advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except
22 that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; not to ex-
23 ceed $10,000 for employment of persons, firms, and others for
24 the performance of special services, including legal services;
25 necessary administrative expenses in connection with the

1 making of loans under the provisions of the Act of January
2 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), and the collec-
3 tion of moneys due the United States on account of loans
4 made under the provisions of said Act and similar Acts
5 administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating
6 to loans for crop production, feed, seed, and harvesting;
7 examination of corporations, banks, associations, and in-
8 stitutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm
9 Credit Administration: *Provided*, That hereafter the ex-
10 penses and salaries of employees engaged in such exam-
11 inations shall be assessed against the said corporations,
12 banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of
13 existing laws except that the amounts collected from the
14 Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal in-
15 termediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916,
16 as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the
17 Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administra-
18 tion shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administra-
19 tion of the administrative supervision of the Federal land
20 banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate
21 credit banks, and the production credit corporations for
22 each fiscal year and shall apportion the amount so
23 determined among such banks and corporations on such equi-
24 table basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall
25 assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks

1 and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered
2 into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which
3 fund is hereby made available to said Administration for
4 expenditure for the purposes set forth in its annual
5 appropriation: *Provided further,* That as soon as practicable
6 after June 30 of each fiscal year said Administration
7 shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the
8 cost of the examination services rendered during such
9 fiscal year to each Federal land bank, joint stock
10 land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2)
11 the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated
12 to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal in-
13 termediate credit bank, and production credit corporation
14 as the cost during such fiscal year of their administrative
15 supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case
16 is greater than the total amount collected from the bank
17 or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be
18 collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be
19 refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation
20 entitled thereto; in all, $626,321, together with not to ex-
21 ceed $4,459,480 from the funds made available to the
22 Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the Act of January
23 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o).
24 Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans: For
25 loans to farmers under the Act of January 29, 1937 (12

1 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), as amended by the Acts of
2 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
3 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
4 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
5 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), the un-
6 obligated balance (exclusive of the amount of such balance
7 made available for "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Ad-
8 ministration, 1945") of the appropriation "Crop production
9 and harvesting loans" as made in the First Deficiency Ap-
10 propriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (Act of February 9, 1937,
11 Public Law 4), and as continued available by the Acts of
12 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
13 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
14 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
15 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), is
16 hereby made available, together with all collections of prin-
17 cipal and interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made
18 under said Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–
19 1020n, 1020o).

20 FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

21 Not to exceed $8,200,000 of the funds of the Federal
22 Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the Act of
23 January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h), shall be
24 available during the fiscal year 1945 for administrative
25 expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in

1 the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses of
2 officers and employees of the Corporation, in accordance
3 with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and
4 the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833);
5 printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, and not
6 to exceed $250 for periodicals and newspapers; contract
7 stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies,
8 equipment, and services; purchase, maintenance, repair, and
9 operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to
10 be used only for official purposes; rent in the District of
11 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
12 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
13 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
14 without other compensation from the United States, in an
15 advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a con-
16 tract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the
17 performance of special services, including legal services; use
18 of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national
19 farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies
20 of the Government as authorized by said Act of January
21 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
22 *Provided,* That all expenditures which under the accounting
23 system prescribed for the Corporation by the General
24 Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments,
25 increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real

1 estate and chattel), shall be considered as nonadministrative
2 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That
3 except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified,
4 and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the admin-
5 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation
6 shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the
7 provisions of said Act of January 31, 1934, as amended
8 (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

9 GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this
11 Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to
12 pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee
13 of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office,
14 agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation,
15 institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or
16 approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or em-
17 ployee of the Department or of any such bureau, office,
18 agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to
19 make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the pro-
20 visions of food production financing bulletins F–1 or F–2,
21 issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under
22 the Food Production Administration, Production Loans
23 Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the
24 applicant represents in writing and it is administratively
25 determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the

1 production of the crops or livestock specified in the appli-
2 cation is not available to him from sources other than the
3 Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from
4 other sources only on such terms and conditions that he
5 could not use the other credit available to the extent neces-
6 sary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or live-
7 stock specified in his application and (b) the person author-
8 ized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional
9 Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity
10 of the crops or livestock specified in the application would
11 be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than
12 would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance
13 under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency
14 Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148),
15 as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins
16 F-1 and F-2 made or approved on the conditions specified
17 in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or
18 advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of
19 the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within
20 one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region
21 which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated
22 as a region in which the making of such loans or advances
23 is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or
24 livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such
25 region: *Provided,* That none of the limitations provided for

1 by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance
2 made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing
3 the completion of production undertaken before July 12,
4 1943, or for the purpose of protecting or preserving
5 the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of
6 any loan or advance made or approved before such date.

7 SEC. 3. Not to exceed 7 per centum of the foregoing
8 amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any
9 bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be
10 available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects
11 included within the general expenses of such bureau,
12 division, or office, but no more than 7 per centum shall be
13 added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of
14 extraordinary emergency.

15 SEC. 4. During the fiscal year for which appropriations
16 are herein made the head of any department or independent
17 establishment of the Government requiring inspections,
18 analyses, and tests of food and other products, within the
19 scope of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and
20 which that Department is unable to perform within the limits
21 of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary,
22 transfer to the Department for direct expenditure such sums
23 as may be necessary for the performance of such work.

24 SEC. 5. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the
25 lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department

1 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and
2 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the
3 conduct of the field work of the Department outside the Dis-
4 trict of Columbia: *Provided,* That such vehicles shall be used
5 only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but
6 this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of
7 motortrucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,*
8 That appropriations contained in this Act shall be available
9 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled
10 and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided fur-*
11 *ther,* That the funds available to the Agricultural Adjust-
12 ment Agency may be used for the maintenance, repair, and
13 operation of one passenger-carrying vehicle in the District
14 of Columbia.

15 SEC. 6. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
16 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
17 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
18 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of
19 emergency of persons in the field service of the Department
20 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
21 on the emergency rubber project; (4) employment by the
22 Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed twenty
23 junior engineer trainees who are citizens of other American
24 republics; and (5) employment under the appropriation for
25 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

1 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this
2 Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person
3 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
4 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
5 States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the pur-
6 poses hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie
7 evidence that the person making the affidavit does not
8 advocate, and is not a member of an organization that
9 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
10 States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That such
11 administrative or supervisory employees of the Department
12 as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary
13 are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons
14 making affidavits required by this section, and they shall
15 charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further,* That any
16 person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization
17 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
18 United States by force or violence and accepts employment
19 the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropria-
20 tion contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,
21 upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or
22 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
23 *further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition
24 to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of exist-
25 ing law: *Provided further,* That nothing in this section
26 shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person

1 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency
2 work involving the loss of human life or destruction of
3 property, and payment of salary or wages may be made
4 to such persons from applicable appropriations for services
5 rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit
6 contemplated by this section.

7 SEC. 8. If at any time during the fiscal year 1945 the
8 termination of the Act entitled "An Act to provide temporary
9 additional compensation for employees in the Postal Serv-
10 ice", approved April 9, 1943, or of the Act entitled "An
11 Act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation
12 to Government employees, and for other purposes", ap-
13 proved May 7, 1943, shall be fixed by concurrent resolution
14 of the Congress at a date earlier than June 30, 1945, the
15 appropriations contained in this Act shall cease to be avail-
16 able on such earlier date for obligation for the purposes of
17 the terminated Act and the unobligated portions of appro-
18 priations allocated for the purposes of such terminated Act
19 shall not be obligated for any other purposes of the appro-
20 priation during the fiscal year 1945.

21 SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Department of
22 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945".

Passed the House of Representatives March 24, 1944.

Attest: SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk.

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

MARCH 28 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 7), 1944

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

propriately referred and the statement presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1911) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to repeal subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The statement submitted by Mr. WAGNER is as follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF CHANGES EFFECTED BY THE RAILROAD SOCIAL INSURANCE BILL IN THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS AND SUBCHAPTER B OF CHAPTER 9 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The railroad social insurance bill consolidates the Railroad Retirement, Railroad Unemployment Insurance, and Carriers Taxing Acts, and the prior service resolution, and amends all of these measures. It is impossible to summarize adequately in brief compass so comprehensive a measure. But in order to indicate their substance, certain of the major changes in existing legislation are here set forth with qualifications and definitions omitted:

1. Coverage:

(a) The Railroad Retirement Board's interpretation of "service in connection" with railroad transportation is made explicit in the bill;

(b) Contractors, independent or otherwise, engaged in operations integrated with those of carriers and susceptible of continuous performance are made employers as are all freight forwarders and hospital associations;

(c) The exclusion of trucking in existing legislation is eliminated;

(d) Railroad subsidiaries which are common carriers by air or water are excluded; and

(e) The authority and rules for segregating employer activities which constitute a minor part of an employing unit are made explicit.

2. Definition of employee: The employment relation provisions in existing legislation are revised to provide that only the following individuals be regarded as having an employment relation:

(i) Employees on bona fide leave of absence on August 29, 1935;

(ii) Employees who have rendered 6 months of service at any time between August 29, 1935, and the enactment of the bill, at least one of which months was before August 29, 1942;

(iii) Employees who because of disability were not recalled, or were unable to return to service after August 29, 1935, or, if they did return, were unable to render the requied number of months of service; and

(iv) Employees who as of August 29, 1935, were absent because of a wrongful discharge.

3. Compensation and years of service:

(a) The term "compensation" is expanded to include—

(i) Payments made to an employee by the employer for any absence; and

(ii) Displacement and coordination allowances.

(b) Wages paid before the normal wage report to the Board will be credited as of the date earned, while subsequent payments will be credited as of the date paid unless the employee requests credit as of the date earned;

(c) Compensation for redcaps for periods of service prior to September 1941 will be credited on the basis of average monthly compensation during the 12 months ending August 31, 1941;

(d) Compensation will be creditable to the end of the year rather than to the end of the month in which age 65 is attained;

(e) Compensation is creditable in any calendar year up to $300 times the number of months of service in the year;

(f) The definition of "years of service" is changed so as to include periods with respect to which payments of the kind described under (a), (b), (c), and (d) were made; and

(g) An employee entitled to credit for service prior to August 29, 1935, may include therein such of it as was rendered to a person not an employer if such service involved the use of standard railroad equipment and was performed by an employer on August 29, 1935.

4. Liberalization of permanent and total disability annuity:

(a) An employee who is permanently and totally disabled for regular employment for hire and who has completed 10 years of service is entitled to an annuity without reduction by reason of being less than 65 years of age;

(b) An employee who has completed 20 years of service or who has attained age 60, who is disabled for his regular occupation, and who, at the time of becoming disabled, is or has recently been connected with the industry, is entitled to an annuity without reduction; and

(c) All reductions in disability annuities, and all compensatory reductions in age annuities payable to persons who have recovered after having been awarded a disability annuity, are eliminated.

5. Minimum annuities: Existing provisions for minimum annuities are eliminated and in place thereof it is specified that employees having 5 years or more of service and who, at the time of retirement, are or recently have been connected with the industry are entitled to receive (i) $3 per month for each year of service; (ii) $50; or (iii) the average monthly compensation, whichever of the three is least.

6. Annuities for surviving dependents of employees, annuitants and pensioners:

(a) The surviving wife of an employee or annuitant who prior to death or retirement had been in employment covered by the bill, or title II of the Social Security Act and the bill, for one-half of the completed calendar quarters after 1936 and before death or retirement, or for at least 40 such quarters is entitled to monthly benefits upon attaining age 65, or so long as she has children, under 18, of the deceased in her care. The basic monthly benefit is based upon application of the Social Security formula (40 percent of the first $50 of average monthly compensation plus 10 percent of the excess over $50 up to $375, the sum of the two preceding being increased by 1 percent for each calendar year in which $200 or more were earned) to the sum of wages under title II of the Social Security Act and one and one-half times the wages under the bill;

(b) Similar benefits are provided for widows of annuitants and pensioners with 10 or more years of service but who do not qualify by reason of no service, or insufficient service, after 1936, the 1-percent increment, however, being omitted;

(c) Monthly benefits are also provided for children, while under 18, of qualified deceased employees and annuitants;

(d) If no widow or child entitled to monthly benefits survives a deceased employee, any surviving dependent parent is entitled to monthly benefits upon attaining age 65;

(e) If no one entitled immediately to monthly benefits survives, a lump sum of eight times the basic monthly benefit is payable;

(f) The monthly benefit for a widow is three-quarters of the normal monthly amount derived by application of the Social Security formula, and that for a child or parent is one-half the basic monthly benefit; and

(g) Monthly benefits based on the compensation and wages of a single individual may not exceed $120, or twice the basic monthly benefit, or 80 percent of the average monthly wage, whichever of the three is least.

7. Unemployment insurance:

(a) The duration of benefits in a single benefit year is increased from 100 to 130 days; that is, from 21 to 27 weeks of continuous unemployment;

(b) Credit for military service is extended for unemployment insurance base year purposes at the rate of $160 per month; and

(c) Benefits are payable for periods of illness arising from nonoccupational causes (accidental or otherwise) and for periods just preceding and succeeding childbirth at the same rate and for the same number of days as for unemployment.

8. Finances:

(a) Taxes for the support of the railroad retirement system are raised to 5¾ percent each on employees and employers up to January 1, 1946; to 6 percent each in 1946–48; and to 6¼ percent each in 1949 and thereafter;

(b) Unemployment insurance contributions remain unchanged;

(c) All proceeds of the tax are to go automatically into the railroad retirement account from which annual appropriations are to be made for administrative expenses; and

(d) Taxes and contributions are to be collected by the Board.

9. Administration:

(a) An appeals procedure similar to that now available under the unemployment insurance system is made applicable to all benefits administered by the Board;

(b) Appeals from Board decisions lie to the circuit rather than the district courts; and

(c) The scope of judicial review now prescribed in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is made applicable to all cases in the jurisdiction of the Board.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHERRY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.), which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAWKES (for himself and Mr. WALSH of New Jersey) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GURNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"Subsection (b) (2) of section 203 of the Federal Seed Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(C) if in quantities of 20,000 pounds or more per lot and each container has stenciled upon it, or bears a label containing, the lot designation: *Provided*, That the invoice pertaining to such seed bears the various statements required for the respective seeds under section 201 (a) and (b): *And provided further*, That the omission of the various statements required under section 201 (a) and (b) on each container, other than the lot designation, is with the previous knowledge and consent of the consignee.'"

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MINNESOTA AND NORTH DAKOTA (S. DOC. NO. 193)

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, at the request and suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], I present a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a report dated April 16, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on a review of reports on the Red River of the North, Minnesota and North Dakota, the project having relationship to flood control on the Park River and its tributaries in North Dakota, and ask unanimous consent for its printing as a document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES—STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a minority statement relating to the conference report on House bill 2928, to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

The conference report was filed in the Senate last Thursday, and at the time of the meeting of the conferees it was agreed that I should have this opportunity to file a minority statement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. REED was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY STATEMENT RELATING TO CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 2928

It is always pleasant to agree with one's associates. May I say, in the beginning, that this is the first time I have failed to sign a conference report. There are compelling reasons why I do not feel able to do so in this instance.

I regret that my first inability to agree with my associate conferees arises with a bill affecting compensation of postal employees. I served the Post Office Department many years and naturally have a most sympathetic approach to the interests of all postal employees. The reasons which impel my dissent in this case transcend any sentimental attitude toward my past associates.

Consideration of H. R. 2928 by the conferees naturally fell under two headings. The first was overtime; the second was the question of salaries for postmasters.

THE THEORY OF OVERTIME

House bill 2928 was primarily a bill to provide overtime payment for various classes of postal employees, including postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and post-office inspectors. As the bill was passed by the House, it provided overtime for these officials. The Senate amended the bill by striking out overtime payment for postmasters and post-office inspectors. The House refused to concur in the Senate amendment and sent the bill to conference.

I find no fault with a rule that provides compensation based upon hours worked. Such a rule is universal throughout all kinds of business. Once a work week of a reasonable period is determined as a base, additional time obviously should be paid for.

The fact that provision is made for overtime pay argues a varying period of labor from day to day or week to week on the part of the person who receives the added pay. The established workweek period in the Postal Service is 40 hours, and the fact that overtime payment is provided for service in excess of 40 hours is definitely not to be taken as extending all workweeks to 48 hours. The Post Office Department has emphasized that fact from time to time and has undertaken to restrict overtime payments to such additional hours above 40 as may be found necessary to transact postal business.

It logically follows that the determination of the hours above 40 hours per week to be worked and paid for must be determined by some authority above the person actually performing the work and claiming overtime pay. In the second part of this expression, I shall criticize the Post Office Department, to some extent, for the lack of vigorous administration. But with the principle itself I have no quarrel. If this rule is sound, and I think it is, a man working overtime does not himself determine the extent of the work necessary for which extra pay is to be received.

The Postal Service is made up of some thousands of post offices scattered over the country. Overtime payments are made only in post offices of the first, second, and third classes. There are some 16,907 of these. A postmaster, whose compensation is fixed by law and based entirely upon the volume of business done in second- and third-class offices, and to some extent in offices of the first class, is the agent of the Post Office Department in his particular office and responsible to the Post Office Department for the administration of that office. In other words, he is the executive supervising and directing the work of his office. He is the person who has been designated by the Department to determine the necessity for work above 40 hours per week for the assistant postmaster, clerks, carriers, and other employees of his office. The fact that, to a great extent, postmasters have been derelict in the administration of this duty does not lessen their responsibility.

The postmaster not only determines the time necessary for the various employees of his office to work, but, of course, he determines the application of his own labor. The payment of overtime for employees who work under direction, and according to direction, is universal throughout the business world. Nowhere, so far as I have ever heard, is overtime paid to a man who calculates and computes his own hours of labor. That is a sound common-sense business rule. Such men are usually called executives or administrators. Postmasters are either or may be both.

There are good, bad, and indifferent postmasters. In my experience I have met hundreds, perhaps thousands of them, and have carried on much official correspondence with them. They average about the same in ability and experience and honesty as does the human race, generally speaking.

To place upon the postmaster the responsibility of determining, not only the overtime necessary for those post-office employees under his supervision, but add to that responsibility the duty of computing his own overtime, which would be the basis of extra pay for him, is neither fair to the postmaster nor to the public service of which he is a part. For some months, it has been reported through the various postmaster organizations that I was the "villain of the piece," that is, the Senator principally responsible for raising some question about the soundness of the policy involved. I have had several hundred letters and telegrams from postmasters all over the country asserting their honesty, integrity, and patriotism. I have questioned none of these things. I have consistently asserted that it is not good practice in either public or private business to place any individual in the position of determining his own pay, based upon a varying number of hours of work he devotes to his job.

I do declare that a substantial majority of postmasters have not carried out the spirit of the law, nor the instructions of the Post Office Department with regard to the overtime provision contained in Public, No. 509 (H. R. 6759). I shall deal with this more extensively later.

In the consideration of this bill in the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee of the Senate, in the first instance, I took this position and the committee finally concluded to amend the bill, omitting first-, second-, and third-class postmasters from the benefits of overtime payments. I would not undertake to say that all members of the conference accepted this view as necessarily correct, but at least the conferees concluded to drop the idea of paying overtime to postmasters. They handled the pay factor in a different way. I fear that the conferees' method of handling this item is, perhaps, more dangerous, from a standpoint of sound public policy, than the original plan to pay overtime.

HOW OVERTIME WORKS

Relatively little overtime in the Postal Establishment was paid prior to the passage of Public, No. 509 (H. R. 6759), approved March 27, 1942. The workweek of postal employees was fixed at 40 hours. Generally speaking, half holidays on Saturday were granted in first-class post offices and most second-class offices. If the necessary work on Saturday required any employee to work more than 40 hours for that week, he was granted compensatory time off in the following week. (This rule of compensatory time did not apply on the three Saturdays preceding Christmas. Straight overtime could be and was paid for extra Saturday work in that period.)

To meet the unsettlement caused by the breaking out of the war, the Postmaster General, on March 9, 1942, addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House, asking that the law be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime for Saturdays in lieu of compensatory time."

This authority was construed to apply to assistant postmasters, clerks, and carriers. Postmasters and post-office inspectors were not included, and received no overtime payment by virtue of this amendment. That omission is principally the cause of the bill now before us, although the provisions of the bill we are considering goes to other classes of employees, more or less limited in number. I have no objection to the bill so far as these other employees are concerned.

In his letter asking for the passage of H. R. 6759, the Postmaster General said:

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 11 (legislative day, MAY 9), 1944

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. GURNEY to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, viz: At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

Subsection B 2 of section 203 of the Federal Seed Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(C) if in quantities of twenty thousand pounds or more per lot and each container has stencilled upon it, or bears a label containing, the lot designation: *Provided*, That the invoice pertaining to such seed bears the various statements required for the respective seeds under section 201 (a) and (b): *And provided further*, That the omission of the various statements required under section 201 (a) and (b) on each container, other than the lot designation, is with the previous knowledge and consent of the consignee."

5-11-44——E

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. GURNEY to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

MAY 11 (legislative day, MAY 9), 1944

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE 78th-2nd, No. 87
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(Issued May 17, 1944, for actions of Tuesday May 16, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

gricultural appropria-
tion bill (individual
items not indexed)...1,30
ppropriations.....1,2,30
anking and currency....16
operatives.....5
ducation.....24
lectrification.....23,37
arm Security.....19
isheries.....33
lood relief.....4,21
ood distribution...5,7,39
ood production.5,12,18,40
Health.....24
Labor standards.....38
Lend-lease.....13
Loans, farm.....3,5,20,32
Machinery, farm.....6
Manpower.....22,23
Minerals.....31
Mobilization.....22,29
Payments in lieu of
taxes.....26
Personnel.....8
Post-war planning.....5
10,14,17
Price control.....18,35
Priorities.....41
Purchasing.....42
Rationing.....36
Research.....12
Selective service.....9
Small business.....14,25
Surplus property.....42
Taxation.....26
Transportation.10,15,27,34
Veterans.....3,11,20
Virgin Islands.....9

SENATE

T IN SESSION. Next meeting Wed., May 17.

. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945. Appropriations Committee reported with amendments, H.R.4443 (S. Rept.886). As passed by the House the bill carried $535,244,192 in direct appropriations, and the Senate Committee decreased this figure by $10,462,474 to $524,781,718, which is $12,959,755 less than the Budget estimates, and $363,787,665 below the 1944 appropriations (this latter figure includes $170,281,000 due to elimination of parity payments, and $150,000,000 reduction due to elimination of acreage allotment payments under the ACP program. Including direct appropriations, reappropriations, administrative expenses from corporation funds, and RFC loan authorizations, the committee bill provides a total of $729,040,231, which is $301,904,038 below 1944, $29,160,389 aboce the Budget estimates, and $132,385,926 above the House bill.

INCREASES OVER THE HOUSE BILL. Office of Solicitor, $100,000; BAE, $150,000; BAI, $995,384; BPISAE, $140,904; E&PQ. $46,300; (Total ARA, $1,182,588); Forest Service, $3,860,938; Salaries and expenses, WFA, $1,500,000; CCC, $1,750,000 (part of a Budget estimate not considered by House); Conservation and use, $12,500,000 (for payments for harvesting grass and legume seed)(see also "DECREASES UNDER HOUSE BILL"); and in addition, an increase of $750,000 in amount which may be expended for administrative expenses; FCIC, $320,000 increase in reappropriations; Marketing Service, $14,000; FSA, lg&rr Administrative expenses $28,265,000, and RFC loan authorization, $96,710,000; Farm tenancy, administrative expenses, $750,000, and RFC loan authorization, $5,000,000; Water facilities, $1,025,000; REA, Salaries and expenses, $200,000, and $40,000,000 RFC loan authorization (see "DECREASES UNDER HOUSE BILL," below).

DECREASES UNDER HOUSE BILL. Emergency rubber project, $931,600 decrease in reappropriation; Conservation and use, $40,000,000 (Committee intends to propose an amendment to provide Budget transfer of $40,000,000 from Sec. 32 funds); REA loans, $20,000,000 (replaced by a $40,000,000 RFC loan authorization).

LANGUAGE ADDED TO HOUSE BILL INCLUDES: Provision for use of not to exceed $1,000,000 of forest fire cooperation funds without matching; exception in case of walnuts to House prohibition against use of WFA funds for issuance or execution of orders involving assessments for administrative expenses; provision relating to determination by CCC of parity price with respect to certain sales of cotton; provision permitting CCC to dispose of perishable commodities in danger of deterioration or accumulation of stocks without regard to restriction on sale below partiy; authority to use conservation and use funds to purchase farm mater ials and services for aiding farmers in participating in a 1946 ACP program; pro vision for $50,000,000 school lunch program for 1945 from Section 32 funds; a se arate item of language for water facilities, arid and semi-aird areas; provisio for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation; and authority for RFC loans to REA.

LANGUAGE DELETED FROM HOUSE BILL INCLUDES: The "liquidation" language of the Emergency Rubber Project; a prohibition against use of conservation and use fun for incentive or production adjustment payments (unnecessary language, since directive already complied with); limitation on C and U funds for State and natio AAA administrative expenses; provision conditioning the making of payments or grants under ACP program upon conformance with practices approved by the severa AAA State Committees; the political activity and lobbying provision; the so-cal Harness amendment relating to participation in AAA program; and the so-called Cannon amendment requiring SCS--soil conservation district agreements to have prior approval of central State soil policy agencies before becoming effective.

LANGUAGE SUBSTITUTED FOR HOUSE BILL PROVISIONS INCLUDES: amendments to House provisions relating to construction and alteration of buildings of BRC, A&IC, a BPISAE; and amendment of the House prohibition against agricultural wage stabil zation to provide for such activities when a substantial number of producers of commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of WFA Administrator.

THE COMMITTEE REPORT STATES: That the cut of $29,200 in the Office of the Secretary be spread throughout the various items under the appropriation, and n applied solely to the immediate office of the Secretary; in connection with $10,000 increase for economic studies by Allegheny Forest Experiment Station in the anthracite region, "the committee expects that this project and reports the on shall be completed by the end of the fiscal year 1945"; in connection with Emergency Rubber Project provision, "the committee expects that not more than o additional processing mill will be constructed at a cost not to exceed $400,000 in connection with the political and lobbying activities provision, "The committ feels that if there is need for amending the Hatch Act, which prohibits politic activity on the part of Government employees, and the Anti-lobbying Act, which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for lobbying activities, that the matte should be considered by the proper legislative committee, and that any changes proposed should be made equally applicable to all Departments and agencies of Government."

NOTE. Representatives of the bureaus and offices have advised in detail of Committee's actions on the House bill; copies of the hearings were distributed y terday through bureau budget offices and copies of the bill and report should b available today.. General debate on the bill may begin on the Senate floor tod

2. STATE, JUSTICE AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL. Appropriations Committee report with amendments, this bill, H.R. 4204. The Senate committee inserted an item fo Census of Agriculture, $7,250,000.

HOUSE

3. FARM LOANS; VETERANS. Continued debate on S. 1767, the GI Bill of Rights (pp. 4612-37).

Calendar No. 896

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

[Report No. 886]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 28 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 7), 1944

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

MAY 16, 1944

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 15 (legislative day, May 9), 1944, by Mr. RUSSELL, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Office of the Secretary

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, and other personal services in the Office of the Secretary in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of one and the maintenance, repair, and operation of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, $1,700,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $187,390, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

1 year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts
2 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
3 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
4 appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
5 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
6 thereon with representatives of the Department of Agricul-
7 ture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department,
8 shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as
9 changed by such reductions or increases in such appro-
10 priations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the
11 Secretary is authorized to contract for stenographic re-
12 porting services, and the appropriations made in this Act
13 shall be available for such purposes, and to expend from
14 appropriations available for the purchase of lands not to
15 exceed $1 for each option to purchase any particular
16 tract or tracts of land: *Provided further,* That with the
17 approval of the Secretary, employees of the Department
18 stationed abroad may enter into leases for official quar-
19 ters, for periods not exceeding one year, and may pay
20 rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other
21 charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the dis-
22 charge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country
23 where custom or practice requires payment in advance:
24 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by
25 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or

1 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
2 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
3 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
4 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to dam-
5 age threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to
6 future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided fur-*
7 *ther*, That, except to provide materials required in or incident
8 to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
9 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by
10 this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manu-
11 factured from commodities or materials produced outside of
12 the United States.

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor includ-
15 ing personal services in the District of Columbia and else-
16 where, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodi-
17 cals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries
18 by attorneys in the field service, ~~$1,830,632~~ *$1,930,632*, to-
19 gether with such amounts from other appropriations or author-
20 izations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the
21 fiscal year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or
22 portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary,
23 not exceeding a total of $340,000, shall be transferred to
24 and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be
25 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia

not to exceed ~~$1,015,000~~ *$1,063,000*: *Provided however,* that if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $506,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $251,179, shall be transferred to and made a part

of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District of Columbia, $587,955; for preparation and display of exhibits, $46,625 and the preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $59,500, including cooperation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other agencies: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 from which transfers to this appropriation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or

1 distributed by the Office of Information, as the central
2 agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not
3 exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred
4 to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds
5 applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified
6 herein, including personal services in the District of Colum-
7 bia: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion
8 pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a
9 total of $10,000 may be used for the temporary employment.
10 by contract or otherwise, of specialists, technicians, and
11 experts, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as
12 amended: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall
13 be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or
14 State field offices or for the compensation of employees in
15 such offices except that not to exceed $13,900 may be used
16 to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

17 PRINTING AND BINDING

18 For all printing and binding for the Department, includ-
19 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located
20 in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere, except
21 as otherwise in ~~the~~ *this* Act provided, $1,100,000, includ-
22 ing the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
23 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of
24 the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
25 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915

1 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108),
2 and in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
3 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
4 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
5 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
6 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or
7 sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Sena-
8 tors, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they
9 shall direct, but not including work done at the field print-
10 ing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint
11 Committee on Printing, in accordance with the Act ap-
12 proved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided,*
13 That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from
14 the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agri-
15 cultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary
16 for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas
17 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from
18 funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section
19 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as
20 amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and
21 binding in connection with the activities under said section
22 32, and from funds appropriated for "Salaries and expenses,
23 War Food Administration", such sums as may be necessary
24 for printing and binding in connection with functions as-
25 signed to the Office of Information by the War Food Admin-

1 istrator: *Provided further,* That the total amount that may
2 be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding
3 proviso shall not exceed $385,000.

4 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 Salaries and expenses: For purchase and exchange of
6 reference books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books,
7 periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imper-
8 fect series; not to exceed $1,200 for newspapers; for dues,
9 when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership
10 in societies or associations which issue publications to mem-
11 bers only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers
12 who are not members; for salaries in the city of Washing-
13 ton and elsewhere; for official travel expenses, and for library
14 fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary
15 expenses, $543,233, together with such amounts from other
16 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
17 schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such
18 salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions
19 thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceed-
20 ing a total of $750, shall be transferred to and made a part
21 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation not to
22 exceed $369,070, may be expended for personal services in
23 the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That if the total
24 amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal
25 year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts

estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to make copies of bibliographies prepared by the Department library, microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books and other library materials in the Department and sell such bibliographies and reproductions at such prices (not less than estimated cost of furnishing same) as he may determine, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in cooperation with public agencies or organizations, including not to exceed ~~$2,150,000~~ *$2,181,655* for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

1 Economic investigations: For acquiring and diffusing
2 useful information among the people of the United States, for
3 conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations,
4 and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities
5 of the Department, relative to agricultural production, dis-
6 tribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest
7 aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization
8 of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm
9 population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance
10 and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand
11 for the different farm and food products; land ownership
12 and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to
13 agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends,
14 ~~$2,325,236~~ *$2,475,236*, together with such amounts from
15 other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
16 schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such sala-
17 ries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof,
18 as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total
19 of $245,377 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
20 appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts
21 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
22 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts
23 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
24 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this ap-
25 propriation and the amount which may be expended for per-

1 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or
2 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of
3 the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
4 the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
5 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in
6 such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,*
7 That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made
8 available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be
9 used for State and county land-use planning.

10 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
11 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
12 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and
13 livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
14 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
15 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooper-
16 ation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State,
17 and local agencies, and for the collection and publication of
18 statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June
19 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
20 $1,500,000, together with such amounts from other appro-
21 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
22 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and
23 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
24 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
25 $175,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this

1 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
2 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
3 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts esti-
4 mated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
5 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
6 appropriation and the amount which may be expended for
7 personal services in the District of Columbia shall be in-
8 creased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the
9 Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with repre-
10 sentatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate
11 to the requirements as changed by such reductions or in-
12 creases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided*
13 *further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be
14 available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating,
15 or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
16 acreage to be planted in cotton: *Provided further,* That esti-
17 mates of apple production shall be confined to the commercial
18 crop.

19 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
20 RELATIONS

21 Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the functions
22 of the Secretary under the Act of June 5, 1930, as amended
23 (7 U. S. C. 541–545), independently and in cooperation
24 with other branches of the Government, State agencies, pur-
25 chasing and consuming organizations and persons engaged in

1 the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution
2 of farm and food products, and for enabling the Secretary
3 to discharge his functions as a member of the joint Great
4 Britain-United States board known as the Combined Food
5 Board, including the employment of persons and means in
6 the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase of
7 such books and periodicals and not to exceed $500 for news-
8 papers as may be necessary in connection with this work,
9 $481,505.

10 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
11 COMMITTEES

12 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
13 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
14 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
15 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
16 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
17 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
18 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-
19 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
20 thereto.

21 EXTENSION SERVICE

22 PAYMENTS TO STATES; HAWAII; ALASKA; AND PUERTO RICO

23 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
24 Puerto Rico for cooperative agricultural extension work as
25 follows:

1 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
2 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
3 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
4 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935
5 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; additional extension
6 work, the Act approved April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 589),
7 $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929
8 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-
9 Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3
10 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),
11 extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the
12 Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950;
13 Puerto Rico, the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
14 343f–343g) extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bank-
15 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $140,000; in all, Capper-
16 Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $14,198,950.
17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES
18 Administration and coordination of extension work: For
19 the employment of persons and means in the District of
20 Columbia and elsewhere to enable the Secretary to adminis-
21 ter the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8,
22 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or sup-
23 plementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work
24 of the Department and the several States, Territories, and
25 insular possessions, including cooperation with other bureaus

1 and offices of the Department, and Federal, State, county,
2 and other agencies, in the development, preparation, and
3 distribution of educational material designed to increase the
4 effectiveness of cooperative extension work as conducted by
5 the Department in cooperation with land-grant colleges,
6 $748,843, of which amount not to exceed $632,610 may be
7 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

8 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

9 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

10 Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and ex-
11 penses of the Office of Administrator, and personal services
12 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

13 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

14 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
15 provisions of an Act entitled "An Act to provide for research
16 into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to
17 provide for the further development of cooperative agricul-
18 tural extension work and the more complete endowment and
19 support of land-grant colleges", approved June 29, 1935
20 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f) ; for administration of
21 the provisions of section 5 of the said Act, and for special
22 research work, including the planning, programing, co-
23 ordination, and printing the results of such research, to be
24 conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secre-
25 tary may designate or establish, and to which he may make

1 allotments from this fund, including the employment of
2 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
3 $1,226,364, of which amount $742,315 shall be available
4 for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories
5 and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for
6 by section 4 of said Act.

7 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

8 PAYMENT TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

9 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
10 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect
11 the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
12 experiment stations:

13 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
14 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
15 C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
16 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
17 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,
18 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382),
19 $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved
20 June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,463,708; Hawaii,
21 the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b),
22 extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the
23 Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved
24 February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits

1 of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and
2 the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20,
3 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the
4 Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $22,500;
5 in all, for Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved
6 March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extend-
7 ing the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico,
8 $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
9 Puerto Rico, $7,001,208: *Provided,* That in order to pre-
10 vent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural
11 population, $63,708 of the appropriation in this paragraph
12 under the Bankhead-Jones Act shall be available for allot-
13 ment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the
14 same States and Territory which received allotments from
15 this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942.

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 Administration of grants and coordination of research
18 with States: For salaries and expenses, including personal
19 services in the District of Columbia, necessary to enable the
20 Secretary to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved
21 March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May
22 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June
23 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–
24 363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration
25 and for the administration of an agricultural experiment sta-

1 tion in Puerto Rico, $176,169, of which not to exceed
2 $166,122 may be expended for personal services in the
3 District of Columbia; and the Secretary shall prescribe the
4 form of the annual financial statement required under
5 the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are
6 in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the re-
7 search work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment
8 stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research
9 of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon
10 to Congress.

11 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: To enable
12 the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural
13 experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation,
14 illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and
15 not to exceed $8,000 for the erection and alteration of
16 buildings, $107,074; and the Secretary is authorized to
17 sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to
18 the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and
19 the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered
20 into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
21 receipts.

22 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For the employment of persons and means in the District
25 of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed

1 $712,955 for departmental personal services in the
2 District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions
3 of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
4 Industry, and related Acts; and the Secretary, upon applica-
5 tion of any exporter, importer, packer, or owner of, or the
6 agent thereof, or dealer in, livestock, hides, skins, meat, or
7 other animal products, may in his discretion, make inspec-
8 tions and examinations at places other than the headquarters
9 of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge
10 the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence in-
11 curred for such inspections and examinations, the funds
12 derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury
13 of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from
14 which the expenses are paid; collect and disseminate infor-
15 mation concerning livestock and animal products; prepare
16 and disseminate reports on animal industry; purchase in the
17 open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins,
18 or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture,
19 which are sold in the United States, for the detection, pre-
20 vention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals,
21 test the same, and disseminate the results of said tests in
22 such manner as he may deem best, and purchase and destroy
23 diseased or exposed animals, including poultry, or quarantine
24 the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the
25 spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, contagious poultry

1 diseases, or other diseases of animals from one State to
2 another, as follows:
3 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
4 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
5 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
6 District of Columbia, $195,379.
7 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
8 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
9 breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural
10 experiment stations and other agencies, including repairs
11 and additions to and erection of buildings necessary to carry
12 on the experiments (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection
13 or alteration of any one building), $899,500.
14 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
15 diseases of animals, including the alteration and construction
16 of necessary ~~buildings,~~ *buildings* at Beltsville, Maryland (not
17 to exceed $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one
18 building), and necessary expenses for investigations of tuber-
19 culin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $756,939:
20 *Provided*, That fees shall be charged for all diagnoses in con-
21 nection with rabies, except those performed for agencies of
22 the United States Government, in such amounts as the
23 Secretary shall prescribe, and such fees shall be covered
24 into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
25 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the

control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle, ~~$5,240,355~~ *$5,433,232*, together with not to exceed $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided,* That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed, condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further,* That

1 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compen-
2 sation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed
3 one-third of the difference between the appraised value of
4 such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no pay-
5 ment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid
6 by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the
7 animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any
8 payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal
9 or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

10 Hog-cholera control: For the control and eradication of
11 hog cholera and related swine diseases, by such means as
12 may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation
13 of organizations, and other methods, either independently
14 or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county
15 authorities, ~~$114,288~~ *$115,440.*

16 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
17 tine work, including the eradication of southern cattle ticks,
18 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the inspec-
19 tion of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation
20 of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of
21 the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of
22 imported animals, including the establishment and mainte-
23 nance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, im-
24 provements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspec-

1 tion work relative to the existence of contagious diseases,
2 and the mallein testing of animals, ~~$951,253~~ *$1,003,130.*
3 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws
4 relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food prod-
5 ucts, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps,
6 and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to
7 public printing, ~~$8,616,759~~ *$9,359,124.*
8 Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions
9 of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158),
10 regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or ship-
11 ment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product
12 manufactured in the United States and the importation of
13 such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic
14 animals, ~~$272,115~~ *$279,228.*
15 Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus
16 and serum: The sum of ~~$37,007~~ *$38,444* of the appropria-
17 ion made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjust-
18 ment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made avail-
19 able during the fiscal year for which appropriations are
20 herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive,
21 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–
22 855), entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjust-
23 ment Act, and for other purposes", including the employ-
24 ment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and
25 elsewhere.

1 ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER
2 CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

3 In case of an emergency arising out of the existence
4 of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-
5 pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of ani-
6 mals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the
7 livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city
8 of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of
9 appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to ex-
10 ceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such
11 disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past
12 and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with
13 the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of ma-
14 terials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease,
15 wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like
16 or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has
17 complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided,*
18 That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be
19 made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding
20 value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value
21 no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its
22 meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
23 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment
24 by the United States Government for any animals shall not
25 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*

1 That the sum of $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the
2 appropriation of $3,500,000 contained in the Second De-
3 ficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1924, approved De-
4 cember 5, 1924, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth
5 disease and other contagious or infectious diseases of animals,
6 is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which
7 appropriations are herein made to enable the Secretary to
8 control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar
9 diseases in poultry.

10 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

11 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
12 ing not to exceed $410,345 for personal services in the
13 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in
14 carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924
15 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experi-
16 ments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative
17 investigations of the dairy industry in the various States,
18 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Acts of
19 May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c), 2327 (b)),
20 and August 10, 1912 (26 U. S. C. 2327 (c)), relating
21 to process or renovated butter, and the Act of May 23, 1908
22 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the expor-
23 tation of process or renovated butter, repairs to buildings,
24 and not to exceed $10,000 for the construction or alteration
25 of buildings, $812,958.

1 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL
2 ENGINEERING
3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES
4 For the investigation of fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton,
5 tobacco, vegetables, grasses, forage, drug, medicinal, poison-
6 ous, fiber, and other plants and plant industries, of soils and
7 soil-plant relationships, and of the application of engineering
8 principles to agriculture, in cooperation with other branches of
9 the Department, the State experiment stations, and practical
10 farmers; for the erection or alteration of necessary farm build-
11 ings and buildings at the National Arboretum: ~~*Provided,*~~
12 ~~That the cost of any building erected or altered, except head~~
13 ~~houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500~~
14 *Provided, That the cost of erecting any one building, except*
15 *head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500,*
16 *and the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year*
17 *shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the build-*
18 *ing as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater;* and for
19 the employment of persons and means in the city of Washing-
20 ton and elsewhere required for the investigations, experi-
21 ments, and demonstrations herein authorized, as follows:
22 General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses
23 for general administrative purposes, including the salary of
24 Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District
25 of Columbia, $225,000.

Agricultural engineering investigations: For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture; for investigating and reporting upon the different kinds of farm power and appliances; upon farm domestic water supply and sewage disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical farm equipment and rural electrification, upon the engineering problems relating to the processing, transportation, and storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the Act approved April 19, 1930 (7 U. S. C. 424, 425); for giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural and chemical engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins, plans, and reports, ~~$293,639~~ *$378,639, of which (notwithstanding the above limitation upon buildings) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the construction of a building at the Houma (Louisiana) station.*

Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of cereal production and for the study and control of cereal

diseases, for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn and methods of broomcorn production, and for determining the distribution of weeds and means for their control, ~~$645,596~~ *$650,524.*

Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: For investigation of the production of cotton and other fiber crops, including the improvement by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, fiber yield and quality, cotton soil-fertility, and the control of diseases, $456,702, of which sum not less than $14,700 shall be used for experimenting in Sea Island cotton, including its hybridization with other varieties.

Drug and related plants: For the investigation, testing, and improvement of plants yielding drugs, spices, poisons, oils, and related products and byproducts, $70,308.

Dry-land agriculture: For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, ~~$245,000~~ *$257,563*: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment of any new field station.

Forage crops and diseases: For the investigation and improvement of forage crops, including grasses, alfalfas, clovers, soybeans, lespedezas, vetches, cowpeas, field peas, and miscellaneous legumes; for the investigation of green-

1 manure crops and cover crops; for investigations looking to
2 the improvement of pastures; and for the investigation of
3 forage-crop diseases and methods of control, $327,837.

4 Forest pathology: For the investigation of diseases of
5 forest and shade trees and forest products, including a study
6 of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi, bacteria,
7 viruses, and other causes of such diseases, for the purpose of
8 developing methods of control and eradication and deter-
9 mining their application, $255,300.

10 Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: For investiga-
11 tion and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of
12 culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activi-
13 ties concerned with the production of fruits, nuts, vegetables,
14 ornamentals, and related plants, for investigation of methods
15 of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing and utilizing these
16 products, and for studies of the physiological and related
17 changes of such products during processes of marketing and
18 while in commercial storage, ~~$1,458,877~~ *$1,463,877.*

19 Irrigation agriculture: For investigations of crop pro-
20 duction on irrigable lands, the quality of irrigation water
21 and its use by crops, and methods for improving and
22 maintaining the productivity of irrigated soils, $145,000.

23 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and devel-
24 opment of the National Arboretum established under the
25 provisions of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Sec-

1 retary of Agriculture to establish a National Arboretum, and
2 for other purposes", approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
3 191–194), employment of persons and means in the city of
4 Washington and elsewhere, and travel expenses of em-
5 ployees and advisory council, $31,500, of which not to
6 exceed $2,500 may be expended by contract or otherwise
7 for the services of consulting landscape architects without
8 reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or
9 civil-service rules.

10 Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: For
11 investigations in seed and plant introduction, including the
12 study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and dis-
13 tribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs,
14 vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from
15 our possessions, and also wild native plants, for experiments
16 with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this
17 country, for plant-disease investigations, including nema-
18 tology, and for plant and plant-disease collections and
19 surveys, ~~$290,000~~ *$298,913.*

20 Plant Industry Experiment Farm: For the maintenance
21 of a general experiment farm and agricultural station in the
22 vicinity of Beltsville, Maryland, $56,976.

23 Soil and fertilizer investigations: For soil and fertilizer
24 investigations, including soil minerals, soil organic matter, soil
25 solution, soil physical and chemical investigations, soil micro-

1 biology, including the testing of cultures procured in the open
2 market for inoculating legumes, other crops, or soil, and if
3 any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or mis-
4 branded, the results of the tests may be published, together
5 with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by
6 whom the cultures were offered for sale; for investigations
7 of the causes of soil infertility and the maintenance of soil
8 productivity; and for investigations within the United States
9 of fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, including phosphoric acid
10 and potash, and other soil amendments, and their suitability
11 for agricultural use, $346,791.

12 Soil survey: For the investigation of soils and their
13 origin, for survey of the extent of classes and types, and
14 for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise,
15 the results of such investigations and surveys, ~~$162,582~~
16 *$174,582.*

17 Sugar-plant investigations: For sugar-plant investiga-
18 tions, including studies of diseases and the improvement of
19 sugar beets and sugar-beet seed, sugarcane, and other sugar-
20 producing plants, cultural and production methods, and the
21 improvement and maintenance of soil fertility in relation to
22 sugar plants, $370,000.

23 Tobacco investigations: For the investigation and im-
24 provement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production
25 and handling, ~~$131,020~~ *$143,520.*

1 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses connected with investigations,
4 experiments, and demonstrations for the promotion of eco-
5 nomic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
6 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
7 agriculture, for investigating and importing useful and bene-
8 ficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of in-
9 sects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining
10 the best means of destroying insects affecting man and ani-
11 mals, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
12 visions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as
13 amended (7 U. S. C. 146, 147, 151–167, 281, 282), to
14 conduct other activities hereinafter authorized, and for the
15 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious
16 insects and plant pests, independently or in cooperation with
17 other branches of the Federal Government, States, counties,
18 municipalities, corporations, agencies, individuals, or with
19 foreign governments; including the employment of necessary
20 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
21 of which not to exceed $633,886 may be expended for
22 personal services in the District of Columbia, rent, con-
23 struction, alteration, or repair of necessary buildings outside
24 the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That, unless otherwise

1 specifically provided, the cost for the construction or altera-
2 tion of any building shall not exceed $1,500 and the total
3 amount expended for such construction in any one year shall
4 not exceed $7,000, as follows:

5 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
6 trative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau
7 and other personal services, $160,920.

8 Fruit insects: For insects affecting fruits, grapes, and
9 nuts, $457,230.

10 Japanese beetle control: For the control and preven-
11 tion of spread of the Japanese beetle, $400,000: *Provided,*
12 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the
13 cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

14 Sweetpotato weevil control: For the determination and
15 application of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils
16 as, in the judgment of the Secretary, may be necessary,
17 $78,670: *Provided,* That in the discretion of the Secre-
18 tary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
19 control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State
20 has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this pur-
21 pose: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation
22 shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm
23 crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

24 Mexican fruitfly control: For the control and prevention
25 of spread of the Mexican fruitfly, including necessary surveys

1 and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the
2 Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $169,820.
3 *Citrus canker eradication: For determining and apply-*
4 *ing such methods of eradication or control of the disease of*
5 *citrus trees known as citrus canker as in the judgment of the*
6 *Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation with such*
7 *authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers,*
8 *or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such*
9 *purposes, $11,300: Provided, That no part of the money*
10 *herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of*
11 *trees or other property injured or destroyed.*
12 Gypsy and brown-tail moth control: For the control
13 and prevention of spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths,
14 $409,320.
15 Dutch elm disease control: For determining and apply-
16 ing methods of control and prevention of spread of the
17 disease of elm trees known as "Dutch elm disease" and of
18 a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley,
19 $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided,* That, in
20 the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this
21 appropriation shall be made for applying methods of con-
22 trol of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures
23 for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
24 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
25 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential

1 or appropiate for the carrying on of the control program,
2 nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures
3 shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by
4 State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organi-
5 zations concerned: *Provided further,* That expenditures in-
6 curred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not
7 be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions,
8 or contributions: *Provided further,* That no part of this ap-
9 propriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction
10 of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where
11 such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the
12 Government of the United States, or on property included
13 within local experimental control areas: *Provided further,*
14 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost
15 or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

16 Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication: For deter-
17 mining and applying such methods of eradication, control,
18 and prevention of spread of the diseases of peach trees known
19 as "phony peach" and "peach mosaic" as in the judgment
20 of the Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation
21 with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations
22 of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to
23 accomplish such purposes, including the certification of prod-
24 ucts out of the infested areas to meet the requirements of
25 State quarantines, $99,340: *Provided,* That no part of the

1 money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or
2 value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.
3 Forest insects: For insects affecting forests and forest
4 products, under section 4 of the Act approved May 22, 1928
5 (16 U. S. C. 581c), entitled "An Act to insure adequate
6 supplies of timber and other forest products for the people
7 of the United States, to promote the full use for timber grow-
8 ing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States,
9 including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not
10 suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correla-
11 tion and the most economical conduct of forest research in
12 the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforest-
13 ation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest eco-
14 nomics, and related subjects", and for insects affecting orna-
15 mental trees and shrubs, $202,000.
16 Truck crop and garden insects: For insects affecting truck
17 crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco,
18 sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $326,340.
19 Cereal and forage insects: For insects affecting cereal
20 and forage crops, including sugarcane and rice, and including
21 research on the European corn borer, $403,370.
22 Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the com-
23 mon barberry and for applying such other methods of
24 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of cereal
25 rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary

1 to accomplish such purposes, ~~$258,470~~ *$283,470*: *Provided,*
2 That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from
3 this appropriation shall be made for these purposes until a
4 sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have
5 been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
6 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
7 tions for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*
8 *further,* That no part of the money herein appropriated
9 shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured
10 or destroyed.

11 Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $163,730.

12 Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the
13 control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil
14 and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such
15 cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any
16 infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations
17 in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or
18 local Mexican authorities, $738,960.

19 Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and
20 the propagation and distribution by sale of surplus bee-breed-
21 ing stock, $91,950: *Provided,* That the rates at which such
22 sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary
23 and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treas-
24 ury as miscellaneous receipts.

1 Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting
2 man, household possessions, and animals, $175,000.
3 Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identifica-
4 tion and classification of insects, including taxonomic, mor-
5 phological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the
6 maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and
7 dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other
8 agencies concerned with insect-pest control, $145,000.
9 Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in con-
10 nection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious
11 insects and related pests and for the exchange with other
12 countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods,
13 ~~$20,000~~ *$30,000.*
14 Control investigations: For developing equipment or
15 apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication
16 and control of plant pests, determining methods of disin-
17 fecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests,
18 determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases
19 of insect-pest control, $76,485, of which not less than
20 $10,000 shall be used for methyl bromide investigations.
21 Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the inves-
22 tigation and development of methods of manufacturing
23 insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical
24 problems relating to the composition, action, and applica-
25 tion of insecticides and fungicides, $130,520.

1 Transit inspection: For the inspection in transit or
2 otherwise of articles quarantined under the Act of August
3 20, 1912 (7 U. S. C. 161, 164a), as amended, and for the
4 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
5 transported interstate in violation of quarantines promulgated
6 thereunder, $45,900.

7 Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign
8 plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export,
9 and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from
10 Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of
11 the entry into the United States of railway cars and other
12 vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials
13 from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection
14 thereof, including construction and repair of necessary build-
15 ings, plants, and equipment, for the fumigation, disinfection,
16 or cleaning of products, railway cars, or other vehicles enter-
17 ing the United States from Mexico, $797,700: *Provided,*
18 That any moneys received in payment of charges fixed by
19 the Secretary on account of such cleaning and disinfection
20 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

21 Certification of exports: For the inspection, under such
22 rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, of
23 domestic plants and plant products when offered for export
24 and to certify to shippers and interested parties as to the
25 freedom of such products from injurious plant diseases and

1 insect pests according to the sanitary requirements of the
2 foreign countries affected and to make such reasonable
3 charges and to use such means as may be necessary to ac-
4 complish this object, $34,480: *Provided,* That moneys
5 received on account of such inspection and certification shall
6 be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

7 CONTROL OF INCIPIENT AND EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF
8 INSECT PESTS AND PLANT DISEASES

9 Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect
10 pests and plant diseases: To enable the Secretary to carry
11 out the provisions of and for expenditures authorized by
12 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
13 148–148e), including surveys and control operations in
14 Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or
15 local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian
16 citizens, $2,700,000.

17 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY
18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations
20 hereinafter authorized, independently or in cooperation with
21 other branches of the Department, other departments or
22 agencies of the Federal Government, States, State agricul-
23 tural experiment stations, universities, and other State
24 agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business,
25 farm, or other organizations and corporations, individuals,

1 associations, and scientific societies, including the employ-
2 ment of necessary persons and means in the city of Wash-
3 ington and elsewhere, of which not to exceed $198,280 may
4 be expended for personal services in the District of Colum-
5 bia; and for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings out-
6 side the District of Columbia ~~at a total cost not to exceed~~
7 ~~$15,000,~~ *: Provided, That the cost of erecting any one build-*
8 *ing shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any*
9 *one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 per*
10 *centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary,*
11 *whichever is greater*, as follows:

12 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
13 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
14 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
15 District of Columbia, $82,250.

16 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the
17 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
18 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of
19 chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physi-
20 cal, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods,
21 feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances
22 used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the
23 physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of
24 such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and
25 development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar
sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural

1 materials for such purposes; for the technological investiga-
2 tion of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen
3 pack investigations; and to cooperate with associations and
4 scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis,
5 $313,411.

6 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
7 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
8 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
9 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
10 stores; the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and
11 utilization of naval stores; and for the assembling and com-
12 pilation of data on production, distribution, and consumption
13 of turpentine and rosin, pursuant to the Act of August 15,
14 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), $112,100.

15 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the
16 researches established under the provisions of section 202
17 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II, and subject to the
18 provisions of section 393 of title III, of the Agricultural
19 Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292, 1393),
20 including research on food products of farm commodities,
21 $4,244,600.

22 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

23 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
24 ing not to exceed $290,400 for personal services in the
25 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition

1 and Home Economics for conducting either independently
2 or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of
3 the relative utility and economy of agricultural products
4 for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special
5 suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective
6 utilization of such products for these purposes, and such
7 economic investigations, including housing and household
8 buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the
9 rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this
10 subject, $806,630.

11 BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER

12 For general administrative purposes, including main-
13 tenance, operation, ~~construction,~~ *construction* or alteration of
14 necessary buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500 ~~for any~~
15 ~~one building~~, repairs, and other expenses, $130,760: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are
17 rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reim-
18 bursements based on estimated or actual charges) from appli-
19 cable appropriatons, to cover the charges, including handling
20 and other related services, for equipment rentals (including
21 depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies,
22 equipment and materials furnished, stores of which may
23 be maintained at the Center, and for building construction,
24 alteration, and repair performed by the Center in carrying
25 out the purposes of such applicable appropriations and the

1 applicable appropriations may also be charged their pro-
2 portionate share of the necessary general expenses of the
3 Center not covered by this appropriation.

4 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
6 out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act for forest pro-
7 tection against the white pine blister rust, approved April
8 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), and in accordance with the
9 provisions thereof, including the employment of persons and
10 means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,264,026;
11 of which amount $203,173 shall be available to the
12 Department of the Interior for control of white pine
13 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the juris-
14 diction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which
15 are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of
16 the United States; $1,219,900 of said amount to the
17 Forest Service for the control of white pine blister
18 rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and
19 $840,953 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology
20 and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordina-
21 tion of the entire program, method development, and
22 for operations conducted under its direction for such con-
23 trol, including, but not confined to, cooperation with
24 individual States, local authorites and private agencies in the

control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed ~~$887,074~~ *$952,611* for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, and to enable the Secretary to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or

1 more, may be improved out of the appropriations made
2 under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to
3 exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified
4 by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the
5 national forests, including tree planting and other measures
6 to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the
7 formation of floods, and to conserve water and including
8 the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary
9 for information leading to the arrest and conviction for
10 violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or
11 near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury
12 to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions
13 upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care
14 for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or
15 the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate
16 the results of experiments and investigations made by the
17 Forest Service; to purchase lawbooks, reference and tech-
18 nical books, and technical journals for officers of the Forest
19 Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical
20 supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the
21 immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees
22 engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service:
23 *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,500 may be
24 expended for the contribution of the United States to the
25 cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Union

1 of Forest Research Stations and of the Department of
2 Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois:
3 *Provided further,* That the appropriations for the work of
4 the Forest Service shall be available for meeting the expenses
5 of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and
6 handling of supplies, equipment, and materials stored therein
7 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Forest
8 Service and for sale and distribution to other Government
9 activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate
10 with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written
11 cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment,
12 and materials, including the cost of supervision, transporta-
13 tion, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appro-
14 priations current at the time additional supplies and materials
15 are procured for warehouse stocks: *Provided further,* That
16 the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service avail-
17 able for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replace-
18 ment of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for
19 use of such equipment on projects of the Forest Service
20 chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other
21 Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reim-
22 bursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the
23 work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief
24 Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation,
25 repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment manage-

1 ment control, and credited to appropriations currently avail-
2 able at the time adjustment is effected: *Provided further,*
3 That the Forest Service may rent equipment for fire-control
4 purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal
5 agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control
6 under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the
7 amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropria-
8 tions currently available at the time payment is received,
9 as follows:

10 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
11 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
12 salary of the Chief Forester, for the necessary expenses of
13 the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized
14 by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
15 514), and for other personal services in the District of
16 Columbia, $625,000.

17 National forest protection and management: For the
18 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
19 and development of the national forests, including the
20 establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries,
21 including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by
22 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
23 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
24 maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract

1 or otherwise, with authority to renew any contract for
2 such purpose annually, not more than twice, without addi-
3 tional advertising; the maintenance of roads and trails and
4 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
5 necessary for the proper and economical administration,
6 protection, development, and use of the national forests,
7 including experimental areas under Forest Service administra-
8 tion, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary,
9 direct purchases will be more economical than construction,
10 improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to
11 exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and
12 maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control
13 of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cul-
14 tural operations; development and application of fish
15 and game management plans; propagation and transplant-
16 ing of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions
17 of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber
18 and other resources and development and application
19 of plans for their effective management, sale, and use;
20 acceptance of moneys from timber purchasers for de-
21 posit into the Treasury in the trust account, Forest Service
22 Cooperative Fund, which moneys are hereby appropriated
23 and made available until expended for scaling services
24 requested by purchasers in addition to those required by the
25 Forest Service, and for refunds of amounts deposited in

1 excess of the cost of such work; examination, classification,
2 surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting ex-
3 changes authorized by law and of lands within the
4 boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to
5 homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
6 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
7 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
8 512); investigation and establishment of water rights,
9 including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in
10 lands or rights-of-ways for use and protection of water
11 rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the admin-
12 istration and public use of the national forests; and all
13 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
14 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
15 including lands under contract for purchase or for the
16 acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been
17 instituted under the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.
18 521), and the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499,
19 505, 564–570), lands transferred by authority of the Secre-
20 tary from the Resettlement Administration to the Forest
21 Service, and lands transferred to the Forest Service under
22 authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
23 $17,729,426: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be avail-
24 able for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of
25 persons who have lost their lives as a result of fighting fires

1 while employed by the Forest Service: *Provided further,*
2 That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood,
3 and other forest products the amounts made available for
4 schools and roads by the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C.
5 500), and the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501),
6 shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber.
7 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
8 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
9 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
10 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
11 unappropriated public forest lands, $100,000, which amount
12 shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preced-
13 ing fiscal year.
14 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
15 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
16 entitled "An Act to insure adequate supplies of timber and
17 other forest products for the people of the United States,
18 to promote the full use for timber growing and other pur-
19 poses of forest lands in the United States, including farm
20 wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agri-
21 cultural production, and to secure the correlation and the
22 most economical conduct of forest research in the Depart-
23 ment of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber
24 growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related

1 subjects", approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C.
2 581, 581a, 581f–581i), as follows:

3 Forest management: Fire, silvicultural, and other forest
4 investigations and experiments under said section 2, as
5 amended, at forest experiment stations or elsewhere,
6 ~~$498,848~~ *$513,848.*

7 Range investigations: Investigations and experiments to
8 develop improved methods of management of forest and
9 other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment
10 stations or elsewhere, ~~$288,475~~ *$298,475.*

11 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
12 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
13 Laboratory, or elsewhere, ~~$1,092,519~~ *$1,147,519.*

14 Forest survey: A comprehensive forest survey under
15 section 9, $156,246.

16 Forest economics: Investigations in forest economics
17 under section 10, ~~$74,018~~ *$84,018.*

18 Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at
19 forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and
20 demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover char-
21 acteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water
22 conservation, flood control, stream-flow regulation, erosion,
23 climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for de-
24 veloping preventive and control measures therefor, $86,762.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570), ~~$2,500,000 and in addition thereto $29,062 to carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943; in all, $2,529,062~~ *including also not to exceed $50,000 for the study of the effect of tax laws and the investigation of timber insurance as provided in section 3 of said Act, $6,300,000*, of which not to exceed ~~$64,226~~ *$84,381* and $5,000 shall be available for personal services and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively, in the District of Columbia: *Provided, That the Secretary may authorize expenditures not to exceed $1,000,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners.*

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect,

1 through such agencies of the Department as he may desig-
2 nate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act,
3 approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to
4 exceed $532,038) and the provisions of sections 4 (not
5 to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,728),
6 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection
7 of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for
8 the extension of national forests, and for other purposes,
9 in order to promote the continuous production of timber
10 on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7,
11 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary
12 thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate
13 with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-
14 using industries or other appropriate agencies in the
15 application of forest management principles to federally
16 owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so
17 as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation
18 of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and
19 the stabilization of employment and economic continuance
20 of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not
21 to exceed $781,466, of which not to exceed $50,958 may
22 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia;
23 the purchase of reference books and technical journals;
24 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or
25 purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:

1 *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation which is avail-
2 able for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and
3 sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924,
4 shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the
5 State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or in-
6 dividuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that
7 to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make
8 contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to
9 be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further,* That any
10 part of this appropriation allocated for the production or
11 procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds
12 appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to co-
13 operating States for the production or procurement of nursery
14 stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more
15 than three fiscal years: *Provided further,* That in carrying
16 into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry
17 Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish
18 new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such
19 new nurseries.

20 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

21 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
22 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
23 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, of which not to exceed
24 $20,030 may be expended for personal services in the Dis-
25 trict of Columbia.

1 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

2 For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the
3 Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23
4 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and
5 maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under
6 Forest Service administration, including not to exceed
7 $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
8 $4,161,496 for forest development roads and trails, to be
9 immediately available and to remain available until expended:
10 *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the
11 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
12 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and sup-
13 plies used for road and trail construction and maintenance,
14 but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered,
15 or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed
16 $7,500.

17 EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

18 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
19 carry into effect the Act of March 5, 1942, as amended
20 (7 U. S. C. 171–175), including personal services in the
21 District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding
22 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
23 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and
24 periodicals; purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; erection
25 of necessary buildings; procurement of medical supplies or

1 services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance
2 of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, and furnish-
3 ing to employees daily transportation between points of
4 assembly and work projects, ~~including the cost of progres-~~
5 ~~sive and final liquidation of all of said project during the~~
6 ~~fiscal year 1945,~~ there is hereby continued available, in
7 accordance with section 3 of said Act of March 5, 1942,
8 not to exceed ~~$3,952,585~~ *$3,020,985* of the unobligated
9 balances of appropriations made under this head for the fiscal
10 years 1942 and 1943, which balances shall be merged with
11 the appropriation made under this head in the Department of
12 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided,* That any
13 proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from
14 guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales,
15 rentals, and fees resulting from operations under such Act
16 of March 5, 1942, as amended, shall be covered into the
17 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

18 WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
20 the War Food Administration to perform its functions, in-
21 cluding those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310,
22 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by
23 transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private
24 agencies and individuals, other personal services in the
25 District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with

1 the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and com-
2 pensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjust-
3 ment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the tem-
4 porary employment of persons or organizations by contract
5 or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of
6 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary
7 expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of sub-
8 sistence, of persons serving while away from their perma-
9 nent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by
10 the War Food Administration, without other compensation
11 from the United States, except that such expenditures shall
12 not exceed $200,000; printing and binding; the purchase of
13 lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed
14 $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and
15 maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia)
16 of passenger-carrying vehicles; ~~$29,200,000~~ *$30,700,000*:
17 *Provided*, That the applicable appropriations available to the
18 War Food Administration, current at the time services are
19 rendered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed
20 by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by
21 advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or esti-
22 mated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration,
23 incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such non-
24 governmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided*
25 *further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall

be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products, *excepting walnuts,* for administration of such orders: ~~*Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization~~ *Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a substantial number of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration.*

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed ~~$5,458,526~~ *$7,208,526* of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation in carrying out its activities as authorized by law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the District of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and

1 special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but
2 not including other personal services) in connection with the
3 acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dis-
4 position of any real or personal property belonging to the
5 Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses
6 of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as
7 nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Pro-*
8 *vided further,* That none of the fund made available by this
9 paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until
10 an appropriate appropriation account shall have been estab-
11 lished therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a
12 covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be ac-
13 counted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and
14 Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further,*
15 That none of the fund made available by this paragraph
16 shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the
17 sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks
18 of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by
19 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable
20 price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1,
21 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–8) *; and the method*
22 *that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Cor-*
23 *poration loans for determining the parity price or its equiv-*
24 *alent for* $\frac{7}{8}$*-inch middling cotton at the average location used*
25 *in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for*

1 *determining the parity price for $\frac{7}{8}$-inch middling cotton at*
2 *such average location for the purposes of this proviso*: *Pro-*
3 *vided further,* That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale
4 or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substan-
5 tially deteriorated in quality *(or in the case of perishable*
6 *commodities if there is danger of deterioration or of accumu-*
7 *lation of stocks)* or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the
8 extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for
9 seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further,* That no
10 wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the
11 parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided*
12 *further,* That in making regional adjustments in the sale
13 price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher
14 in any area than the United States average parity price of
15 corn.

16 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL
17 LAND RESOURCES

18 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
19 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclu-
20 sive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act,
21 approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C.
22 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjust-
23 ment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407)
24 (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and
25 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including per-

1 sonal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not
2 to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of ex-
3 hibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and inter-
4 national fairs within the United States; purchase of
5 lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, ~~$290,000,000~~
6 *$250,000,000*, to remain available until December 31, 1945,
7 for compliance with programs under said provisions of the
8 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the
9 Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the pro-
10 visions of the 1944 programs carried out during the period
11 July 1, 1943, to December 31, 1944, inclusive, *and, in addi-*
12 *tion, $12,500,000 for making additional payments on an*
13 *acreage and pound basis for harvesting seeds of grasses and*
14 *legumes determined by the War Food Administrator to be*
15 *necessary for an adequate supply of such seeds*: *Provided,*
16 ~~That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation~~
17 ~~in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjust-~~
18 ~~ment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-con-~~
19 ~~servation payments and payment of acreage allotment com-~~
20 ~~mitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Ad-~~
21 ~~justment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set~~
22 ~~forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulle-~~
23 ~~tin, dated February 9, 1944:~~ *Provided further,* That not
24 to exceed ~~$24,250,000~~ *$25,000,000* of said amount shall
25 be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other ad-

1 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs~~; but not~~
2 ~~more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the~~
3 ~~schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the~~
4 ~~appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricul-~~
5 ~~tural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred~~: *Provided*
6 *further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or
7 made available for the functions assigned to the Agricul-
8 tural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order
9 (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to
10 pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information
11 employees or any State or county information employees,
12 but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or sup-
13 plying of information to individual farmers: *Provided fur-*
14 *ther,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and
15 other administrative expenses in connection with the formu-
16 lation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-build-
17 ing practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under
18 the Act of February 29, 1936, and ~~like~~ programs under the
19 Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total
20 expenditures of which, including administration, shall not
21 exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, ferti-
22 lizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand
23 at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants
24 under the 1945 program~~; but the payments or grants under~~
25 ~~such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of~~

~~land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State Committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States~~: *Provided further,* That no part of such amounts shall be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and other administrative expenses except for payment of obligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1944 ~~and 1945~~, *1945, and 1946* programs under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for such materials, or services, and for the payment of

1 all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or
2 part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided*
3 *further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law,
4 persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as
5 tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United
6 States Government and who comply with the terms and condi-
7 tions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, form-
8 ulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said Act
9 of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and
10 receive payments for their participation in said program to
11 the same extent as other producers~~: *Provided further,* That~~
12 ~~no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the~~
13 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau~~
14 ~~or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used~~
15 ~~to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages~~
16 ~~in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but~~
17 ~~not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign~~
18 ~~funds of political parties or to any organization, association,~~
19 ~~corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or in-~~
20 ~~fluencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political~~
21 ~~office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or~~
22 ~~contributions for the distribution of publications and other~~
23 ~~literature designed to influence or aid in the election or~~
24 ~~defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in~~
25 ~~activities designed to influence the action of Congress with~~

~~respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except that employees may furnish to Congress any information authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by Congress, or by any of its committees or members): *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary per diem allowance or expenses of any person, who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.~~

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, there is hereby reappropriated not to exceed ~~$100,000~~ *$420,000* of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the

1 liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton
2 crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.

3 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

4 To carry out the provisions of an Act entitled "An Act
5 to provide for the protection of land resources against soil
6 erosion, and for other purposes", approved April 27, 1935
7 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national
8 program of erosion control and soil and moisture conserva-
9 tion to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other
10 agencies, including the employment of persons and means
11 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to
12 exceed $1,089,837 may be expended for personal serv-
13 ices in the District of Columbia, purchase of books
14 and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one
15 passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia,
16 furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees,
17 and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent
18 buildings: *Provided,* That the cost of any building purchased,
19 erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing
20 a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same
21 with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where
22 buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being pur-
23 chased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to
24 be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
25 *Provided further,* That no money appropriated in this Act

shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further,* That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment~~: *Provided further,* That in any case in which a State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district~~, as follows:

1 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
2 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects
3 of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil
4 and moisture conservation (including the construction and
5 hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage) ; and
6 for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental
7 watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations,
8 $1,225,000.

9 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preven-
10 tive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such
11 special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and
12 the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of
13 farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and
14 operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation
15 plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
16 $28,340,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appro-
17 priation may be expended for soil and water con-
18 servation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided*
19 *further,* That any part of this appropriation allocated for
20 the production or procurement of nursery stock by any
21 Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency
22 for allocation to cooperating States for the production or
23 procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for
24 expenditure for not more than three fiscal years.

25 Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For

research and demonstration work in soil conservation control measures, including research and demonstration work in fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $72,248: *Provided,* That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida, or a political subdivision thereof, for the same purposes.

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $1,250,000.

EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

To enable the Secretary to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said Act shall be available to the Secretary for

1 *the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch*
2 *program under clause (2) of said section 32 in a sum not*
3 *exceeding $50,000,000: Provided, That such funds shall*
4 *be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1945*
5 *without regard to the requirement therein relating to the*
6 *encouragement of domestic consumption but no part of such*
7 *funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity*
8 *heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration.*

9 SUGAR ACT

10 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions,
11 other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands,
12 of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as
13 amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including the employ-
14 ment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and
15 elsewhere, as authorized by said Act, $52,510,203, to remain
16 available until June 30, 1946.

17 MARKETING SERVICE

18 For the employment of such persons and means in the
19 city of Washington and elsewhere (including not to exceed
20 $1,408,617 for departmental personal services in the Dis-
21 trict of Columbia) as may be necessary in conducting in-
22 vestigations, experiments, and demonstrations, either inde-
23 pendently or in cooperation with public or private agencies,
24 organizations, or individuals, as follows:

25 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and

1 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely infor-
2 mation on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
3 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
4 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
5 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and
6 their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and
7 other agricultural products, independently and in coopera-
8 tion with other branches of the Government, State agencies,
9 purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons en-
10 gaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and dis-
11 tribution of farm and food products. ~~$1,267,290~~ *$1,271,290.*

12 Market inspection of farm products: For enabling
13 the Secretary, independently and in cooperation with other
14 branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and
15 consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of com-
16 merce, or other associations of businessmen or trade organiza-
17 tions, and persons or corporations engaged in the production,
18 transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food
19 products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions,
20 to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested
21 parties the class, quality, and condition of cotton, tobacco,
22 fruits, and vegetables, whether raw, dried, canned, or other-
23 wise processed, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm
24 products when offered for interstate shipment or when re-
25 ceived at such important central markets as the Secretary may

1 from time to time designate, or at points which may be con-
2 veniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations
3 as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be
4 reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for
5 the service rendered: *Provided,* That officers and employees
6 who, under proper authorization, use privately owned motor
7 vehicles in the performance of official travel within the
8 corporate limits of their official stations for the purpose of
9 inspecting and grading farm and food products and the
10 supervision thereof at points located within the said cor-
11 porate limits may be reimbursed for such travel at a rate
12 not to exceed 3 cents per mile: *Provided further,* That
13 certificates issued by the authorized agents of the Depart-
14 ment shall be received in all courts of the United States
15 as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein
16 contained, $547,679.

17 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
18 among the people of the United States useful information
19 relative to the standardization, classification, grading, prep-
20 aration for market, handling, and marketing of farm and
21 food products, including the demonstration and promotion
22 of the use of uniform standards of classification of American
23 farm and food products throughout the world, and for making
24 analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7,
25 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), $451,500: *Provided,* That

1 samples, illustrations, practical forms, or sets of the grades
2 recommended or promulgated by the Secretary for farm or
3 food products may be sold under such rules and regulations
4 as he may prescribe, and the receipts therefrom deposited
5 in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

6 Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards
7 Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
8 visions of an Act entitled "An Act to establish and promote
9 the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide
10 and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for
11 other purposes", approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C.
12 511–511q), and an Act entitled "An Act to provide for
13 the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the
14 Department of Agriculture", approved January 14, 1929
15 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, $933,500.

16 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
17 and Standard Container Acts: To enable the Secretary to
18 carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural
19 Commodities Act, approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7
20 U. S. C. 499a–499r), and the Act to prevent the
21 destruction or dumping of farm produce, and for other
22 purposes, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491–
23 497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916,
24 as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the Act to fix stand-
25 ards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets

1 for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes, approved
2 May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $210,000.
3 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts:
4 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of
5 the Act authorizing him to collect and publish statistics of
6 the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3,
7 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
8 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by
9 chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton
10 futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect
11 the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act,
12 approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
13 including such means as may be necessary for effectuating
14 agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and
15 other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the
16 adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton
17 classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes
18 with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution,
19 inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies
20 thereof under such agreements, $1,210,783.
21 United States Grain Standards Act: To enable the
22 Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United
23 States Grain Standards Act, $860,999.
24 United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary

1 to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Ware-
2 house Act, $533,930.

3 Federal Seed Act: To enable the Secretary to carry
4 into effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to
5 regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require
6 labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in inter-
7 state commerce; to require certain standards with respect to
8 certain imported seeds; and for other purposes", approved
9 August 9, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 1561–1610), $117,700: *Pro-*
10 *vided,* That not to exceed $250 of this amount may be used
11 for meeting the share of the United States in the expenses
12 of the International Seed Testing Congress in carrying out
13 plans for correlating the work of the various adhering gov-
14 ernments on problems relating to seed analysis or other
15 subjects which the Congress may determine to be necessary
16 in the interest of international seed trade.

17 Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the pro-
18 visions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August
19 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
20 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $418,700.

21 Naval Stores Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry
22 into effect the provisions of the Naval Stores Act of March
23 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 91–99), $34,728.

24 Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry

1 into effect the provisions of the Act of April 26, 1910 (7
2 U. S. C. 121–134), entitled "An Act for preventing the
3 manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or mis-
4 branded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and
5 also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other
6 purposes", $215,208.

7 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary to
8 carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange
9 Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), and as further
10 amended by the Act of October 9, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 2),
11 $348,797.

12 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the
13 provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II
14 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C.
15 1291), $78,762.

16 *LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION*

17 *To enable the Secretary through the War Food Admin-*
18 *istration to continue to provide assistance through rural re-*
19 *habilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States,*
20 *its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt*
21 *adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and*
22 *grants under this and prior laws, (2) loans to needy indi-*
23 *vidual farmers, (3) grants, and (4) liquidation as ex-*
24 *peditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects*
25 *under the supervision of the War Food Administration,*

1 *$28,265,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary*
2 *administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including*
3 *personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere;*
4 *not to exceed $57,000 for compensation of experts without*
5 *regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; pur-*
6 *chase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and news-*
7 *papers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-pro-*
8 *pelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding:*
9 *Provided, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit*
10 *to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to*
11 *the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under*
12 *his supervision, showing by name and by States all dis-*
13 *positions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with*
14 *the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of*
15 *liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.*
16 *In making any grant payments under this Act, the Sec-*
17 *retary is authorized to require with respect to such payments*
18 *the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal*
19 *and non-Federal, including work on private or public land*
20 *in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and*
21 *the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C.*
22 *796), as amended, relating to disability or death compen-*
23 *sation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing*
24 *such work: Provided, That this section shall not apply to any*
25 *case coming within the purview of the workmen's compen-*

1 *sation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which*
2 *the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar*
3 *benefits for injury or death.*

4 *For additional funds for the purpose of making rural*
5 *rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are*
6 *unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the*
7 *area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Recon-*
8 *struction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to*
9 *make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an*
10 *aggregate amount of not to exceed $96,710,000. Such ad-*
11 *vances shall be made (1) with interest at not to exceed the*
12 *rate of 3 per centum per annum payable semiannually; (2)*
13 *upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corpora-*
14 *tion heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursu-*
15 *ant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 per*
16 *centum of the then unpaid principal amount of the obliga-*
17 *tions securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms*
18 *and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation*
19 *may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corpora-*
20 *tion, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as*
21 *payments of principal and interest on the loans made from*
22 *the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations*
23 *held by the Corporaton as security for such advances, until*
24 *such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes de-*
25 *bentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corpora-*

1 *tion is authorized and empowered to issue and to have out-*
2 *standing at any one time under the provisions of law in force*
3 *on the date this Act takes effect is hereby increased by an*
4 *amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.*
5 *None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized*
6 *under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilita-*
7 *tion") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land*
8 *or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing*
9 *program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective*
10 *farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, pro-*
11 *motion or management of homestead associations, land-leas-*
12 *ing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative*
13 *land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant pur-*
14 *chasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible*
15 *of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making*
16 *of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or*
17 *(4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or*
18 *(5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the*
19 *purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative*
20 *association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services)*
21 *or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in*
22 *the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agri-*
23 *cultural commodities.*
24 *The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds admin-*

1 *istered by him as trustee under the various transfer agree-*
2 *ments with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations*
3 *only for purposes for which funds made available under this*
4 *caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to*
5 *such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such*
6 *trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.*

7 *The appropriation and authorizations herein made under*
8 *the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", shall*
9 *constitute the total amount to be available for obligation*
10 *under this heading during the fiscal year 1945 and shall*
11 *not be supplemented by funds from any source.*

12 *No part of the appropriation herein made under the*
13 *heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be*
14 *available to pay the compensation of any person appointed*
15 *in accordance with the civil-service laws.*

16 FARM TENANCY

17 To enable the Secretary through the War Food Admin-
18 istration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the
19 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
20 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

21 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in con-
22 nection with the making of loans under title I of the
23 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
24 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due
25 the United States on account of loans heretofore made under

1 the provisions of said Act, including the employment of
2 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
3 exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said
4 Act, ~~$750,000~~ *$1,500,000.*

5 Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance
6 with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
7 approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006),
8 ~~$15,000,000~~ *$20,000,000,* which sum shall be borrowed
9 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest
10 rate of 3 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be
11 used for making loans under the terms of said Act for the pur-
12 chase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit
13 of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality
14 in which such purchase may be made, which value shall
15 be determined solely according to statistics of the farm
16 census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
17 poration is hereby authorized and directed to lend such
18 sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obliga-
19 tions of borrowers from the Secretary under the pro-
20 visions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
21 Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006):
22 *Provided,* That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction
23 Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the
24 principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting
25 the security therefor: *Provided further,* That the Secretary

1 may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest
2 on any loans made under such title I to repay the Recon-
3 struction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed there-
4 from under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further,*
5 That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such
6 obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation
7 is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding
8 at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by
9 an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

10 *WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS*

11 *To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into*
12 *effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to promote*
13 *conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United*
14 *States by aiding in the development of facilities for water*
15 *storage and utilization, and for other purposes", approved*
16 *August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x,*
17 *590z–5), including the exchange, operation, and maintenance*
18 *of passenger-carrying vehicles, $1,025,000, of which not to*
19 *exceed $11,000 may be expended for personal services in the*
20 *District of Columbia.*

21 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

22 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
23 sions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved
24 May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), as
25 follows:

1 Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and
2 expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports
3 including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrifica-
4 tion Administration, and other personal services in the Dis-
5 trict of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange
6 of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and
7 periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to
8 exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, ~~$2,550,000~~
9 *$2,750,000.*

10 Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and
11 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses
12 incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section
13 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as
14 amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), ~~$20,000,000~~ *$40,000,000,*
15 *which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction*
16 *Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions*
17 *of section 3 (a) of said Act and shall be considered*
18 *as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction*
19 *Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed*
20 *to lend such sum in addition to the amounts hereto-*
21 *fore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without*
22 *regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section*
23 *3 (e) of said Act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures,*
24 *and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance*
25 *Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have*

1 *outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby*
2 *increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions*
3 *hereof.*

4 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Admin-
7 istration in the District of Columbia and the field, including
8 printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to
9 exceed $5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority
10 attending meetings or conventions of members of organiza-
11 tions at which matters of importance to the work of the
12 Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or trans-
13 acted; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $750
14 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic
15 reporting services; library membership fees or dues in
16 organizations which issue publications to members only or
17 to members at a lower price than to others, payment for
18 which may be made in advance; not to exceed $10,000 for
19 purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by
20 personal service without regard to the provisions of any
21 other Act; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation
22 of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in the District
23 of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of
24 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
25 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of

1 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
2 without other compensation from the United States, in an
3 advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except
4 that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; not to ex-
5 ceed $10,000 for employment of persons, firms, and others for
6 the performance of special services, including legal services;
7 necessary administrative expenses in connection with the
8 making of loans under the provisions of the Act of January
9 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), and the collec-
10 tion of moneys due the United States on account of loans
11 made under the provisions of said Act and similar Acts
12 administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating
13 to loans for crop production, feed, seed, and harvesting;
14 examination of corporations, banks, associations, and in-
15 stitutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm
16 Credit Administration: *Provided,* That hereafter the ex-
17 penses and salaries of employees engaged in such exam-
18 inations shall be assessed against the said corporations,
19 banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of
20 existing laws except that the amounts collected from the
21 Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal in-
22 termediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916,
23 as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the
24 Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administra-
25 tion shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administra-

1 tion of the administrative supervision of the Federal land
2 banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate
3 credit banks, and the production credit corporations for
4 each fiscal year and shall apportion the amount so
5 determined among such banks and corporations on such equi-
6 table basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall
7 assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks
8 and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered
9 into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which
10 fund is hereby made available to said Administration for
11 expenditure for the purposes set forth in its annual
12 appropriation: *Provided further,* That as soon as practicable
13 after June 30 of each fiscal year said Administration
14 shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the
15 cost of the examination services rendered during such
16 fiscal year to each Federal land bank, joint stock
17 land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2)
18 the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated
19 to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal in-
20 termediate credit bank, and production credit corporation
21 as the cost during such fiscal year of their administrative
22 supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case
23 is greater than the total amount collected from the bank
24 or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be
25 collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be

1 refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation
2 entitled thereto; in all, $626,321, together with not to ex-
3 ceed $4,459,480 from the funds made available to the
4 Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the Act of January
5 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o).
6 Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans: For
7 loans to farmers under the Act of January 29, 1937 (12
8 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), as amended by the Acts of
9 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
10 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
11 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
12 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), the un-
13 obligated balance (exclusive of the amount of such balance
14 made available for "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Ad-
15 ministration, 1945") of the appropriation "Crop production
16 and harvesting loans" as made in the First Deficiency Ap-
17 propriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (Act of February 9, 1937,
18 Public Law 4), and as continued available by the Acts of
19 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
20 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
21 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
22 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), is
23 hereby made available, together with all collections of prin-
24 cipal and interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made

1 under said Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i-
2 1020n, 1020o).

3 FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

4 Not to exceed $8,200,000 of the funds of the Federal
5 Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the Act of
6 January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020-1020h), shall be
7 available during the fiscal year 1945 for administrative
8 expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in
9 the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses of
10 officers and employees of the Corporation, in accordance
11 with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and
12 the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821-833);
13 printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, and not
14 to exceed $250 for periodicals and newspapers; contract
15 stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies,
16 equipment, and services; purchase, maintenance, repair, and
17 operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to
18 be used only for official purposes; rent in the District of
19 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
20 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
21 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
22 without other compensation from the United States, in an
23 advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a con-
24 tract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the
25 performance of special services, including legal services; use

1 of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national
2 farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies
3 of the Government as authorized by said Act of January
4 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
5 *Provided,* That all expenditures which under the accounting
6 system prescribed for the Corporation by the General
7 Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments,
8 increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real
9 estate and chattel), shall be considered as nonadministrative
10 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That
11 except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified,
12 and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the admin-
13 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation
14 shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the
15 provisions of said Act of January 31, 1934, as amended
16 (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this
19 Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to
20 pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee
21 of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office,
22 agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation,
23 institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or
24 approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or em-
25 ployee of the Department or of any such bureau, office,

1 agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to
2 make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the pro-
3 visions of food production financing bulletins F-1 or F-2,
4 issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under
5 the Food Production Administration, Production Loans
6 Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the
7 applicant represents in writing and it is administratively
8 determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the
9 production of the crops or livestock specified in the appli-
10 cation is not available to him from sources other than the
11 Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from
12 other sources only on such terms and conditions that he
13 could not use the other credit available to the extent neces-
14 sary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or live-
15 stock specified in his application and (b) the person author-
16 ized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional
17 Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity
18 of the crops or livestock specified in the application would
19 be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than
20 would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance
21 under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency
22 Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148),
23 as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins
24 F-1 and F-2 made or approved on the conditions specified
25 in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or

1 advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of
2 the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within
3 one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region
4 which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated
5 as a region in which the making of such loans or advances
6 is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or
7 livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such
8 region: *Provided,* That none of the limitations provided for
9 by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance
10 made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing
11 the completion of production undertaken before July 12,
12 1943, or for the purpose of protecting or preserving
13 the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of
14 any loan or advance made or approved before such date.

15 SEC. 3. Not to exceed 7 per centum of the foregoing
16 amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any
17 bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be
18 available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects
19 included within the general expenses of such bureau,
20 division, or office, but no more than 7 per centum shall be
21 added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of
22 extraordinary emergency.

23 SEC. 4. During the fiscal year for which appropriations
24 are herein made the head of any department or independent
25 establishment of the Government requiring inspections,

1 analyses, and tests of food and other products, within the
2 scope of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and
3 which that Department is unable to perform within the limits
4 of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary,
5 transfer to the Department for direct expenditure such sums
6 as may be necessary for the performance of such work.

7 SEC. 5. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the
8 lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department
9 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and
10 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the
11 conduct of the field work of the Department outside the Dis-
12 trict of Columbia: *Provided,* That such vehicles shall be used
13 only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but
14 this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of
15 motortrucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,*
16 That appropriations contained in this Act shall be available
17 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled
18 and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided fur-*
19 *ther,* That the funds available to the Agricultural Adjust-
20 ment Agency may be used for the maintenance, repair, and
21 operation of one passenger-carrying vehicle in the District
22 of Columbia.

23 SEC. 6. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
24 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
25 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-

1 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of
2 emergency of persons in the field service of the Department
3 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
4 on the emergency rubber project; (4) employment by the
5 Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed twenty
6 junior engineer trainees who are citizens of other American
7 republics; and (5) employment under the appropriation for
8 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

9 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this
10 Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person
11 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
12 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
13 States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the pur-
14 poses hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie
15 evidence that the person making the affidavit does not
16 advocate, and is not a member of an organization that
17 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
18 States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That such
19 administrative or supervisory employees of the Department
20 as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary
21 are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons
22 making affidavits required by this section, and they shall
23 charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further,* That any
24 person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization
25 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the

1 United States by force or violence and accepts employment
2 the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropria-
3 tion contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,
4 upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or
5 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
6 *further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition
7 to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of exist-
8 ing law: *Provided further,* That nothing in this section
9 shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person
10 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency
11 work involving the loss of human life or destruction of
12 property, and payment of salary or wages may be made
13 to such persons from applicable appropriations for services
14 rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit
15 contemplated by this section.

16 SEC. 8. If at any time during the fiscal year 1945 the
17 termination of the Act entitled "An Act to provide temporary
18 additional compensation for employees in the Postal Serv-
19 ice", approved April 9, 1943, or of the Act entitled "An
20 Act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation
21 to Government employees, and for other purposes", ap-
22 proved May 7, 1943, shall be fixed by concurrent resolution
23 of the Congress at a date earlier than June 30, 1945, the
24 appropriations contained in this Act shall cease to be avail-
25 able on such earlier date for obligation for the purposes of

1 the terminated Act and the unobligated portions of appro-
2 priations allocated for the purposes of such terminated Act
3 shall not be obligated for any other purposes of the appro-
4 priation during the fiscal year 1945.

5 SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Department of
6 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945".

Passed the House of Representatives March 24, 1944.

Attest: SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 896

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

[Report No. 886]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

MARCH 28 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 7), 1944

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

MAY 16, 1944

Reported with amendments

Calendar No. 896

78TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 886

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

MAY 16, 1944.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4443]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House	$535, 244, 192
Decrease by Senate (net)	10, 462, 474
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	524, 781, 718
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates for 1945	537, 741, 473
Amount of appropriations for 1944	888, 569, 383
The bill as reported to Senate:	
Under the appropriations for 1944	363, 787, 665
Under the estimates for 1945	12, 959, 755

The changes in the amounts of the House bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Office of the Secretary:

Salaries and expenses:

(The House made a reduction of $29,200 below the Budget estimate in this appropriation. The Committee does not recommend the restoration of this amount to the bill but recommends that the $29,200 reduction be applied not solely to the immediate Office of the Secretary but rather that it be spread throughout the various items financed under this appropriation.)

Office of the Solicitor:

Salaries and expenses $100,000

(The House reduced this appropriation $125,000 below the Budget estimate, primarily due to the elimination of funds for "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," and elimination of the Budget estimate for the revival and continuance of the Federal Crop insurance program. Inasmuch as the Committee is recommending that funds be made available under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," it is also recommending the restoration of $100,000 of the $125,000 reduction by the House in the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor." The Committee also recommends that the District of Columbia personal service limitation be increased by $48,000.)

Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

Economic investigations 150,000

The committee recommend that the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia be increased by $31,655 to restore this limitation to the amount of the Budget estimate.

Agricultural Research Administration:

Bureau of Animal Industry:

To provide for the reclassification of veterinarians and meat and livestock inspectors under the Bureau of Animal Industry, as proposed in the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1945, the committee recommends the following increases, totaling in direct appropriations, $995,384:

Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease	192,877
Hog cholera control	1,152
Inspection and quarantine	51,877
Meat inspection	742,365
Virus Serum Toxin Act	7,113

Marketing agreements with respect to hog-cholera virus and serum:

(The committee recommend that the limitation on the amount made available under this heading out of the appropriation made by sec. 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, be increased from $37,007 to $38,444, or an increase in the limitation of $1,437.)

Total, Bureau of Animal Industry 995,384

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering:

Limitation on erection of and alterations to buildings:

The committee recommend that the following language be deleted from the bill:

Provided, That the cost of any building erected or altered, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

Provided, That the cost of erecting any one building, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater

Agricultural Research Administration—Continued.

(The House proviso does not provide for a separate limitation for alteration costs, but provides an over-all limitation covering both construction costs and any subsequent costs of alteration. The types of buildings that have been erected under the authority heretofore carried in the Appropriation Act consist of small laboratory and office buildings, machine shops, seed storage houses, implement storage sheds, and similar small buildings at field stations, necessary in the conduct of the Bureau's crop and soil research program. The Department points out that many such buildings have been in use for a number of years and that it is necessary from time to time to make minor alterations to meet changing requirements of the research work, such as structural alterations incident to installation of laboratory and shop equipment, or to rearrange space for storage of seed, fertilizers, and farm machinery. The language as carried in the House bill would appear to preclude making alterations to buildings that cost $2,500 or more to construct. In order to provide for the efficient utilization of buildings at field stations it is necessary to have authorization to make minor alterations to meet changing needs, and the committee has accordingly recommended the above substitute for the House language.)

Agricultural engineering investigations:	
For development and improvement of labor-saving machinery for sugarcane production, harvesting, and weed and insect control	$65,000
For work on mechanization of sugar-beet agriculture to be carried on cooperatively with State Experiment Stations	20,000
Total, agricultural engineering investigations	85,000
Cereal crops and diseases:	
Tucumcari, N. Mex., station	150
Dickinson, N. Dak., station	4,778
Total, cereal crops and diseases	4,928
Dry-land agriculture:	
U. S. Dry-Land Field Station, Lawton, Okla	10,163
Cooperative work at State Branch Station, Moro, Oreg	2,400
Total, dry-land agriculture	12,563
Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases:	
Azalea Flower Spot disease	5,000
Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys:	
U. S. Plant Introduction Garden, Savannah, Ga	8,913
Soil survey	12,000
Tobacco investigations	12,500
(The committee recommend this amount for work on burley tobacco in North Carolina. In recommending this item in the amount of $12,500, it is the understanding of the committee that the State of North Carolina is to match it in a like amount.)	
Total, Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering	140,904

Agricultural Research Administration—Continued.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:	
Citrus-canker eradication	$11,300
Barberry eradication	25,000
(The committee recommend this amount for barberry eradication work in the State of Washington.)	
Foreign parasites:	
Work on the Klamath weed	10,000
Total, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	46,300

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry:

Limitation on erection, alteration, and repair of buildings:

The committee recommend that the following language in the bill be amended as indicated:

; and for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings outside the District of Columbia ~~at a total cost not to exceed $15,000,~~ *: Provided, That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater.*

(The House language places a $15,000 limitation on the erection, alteration, and repair of buildings outside the District of Columbia. The enabling act authorizing the establishment of the Regional Research Laboratories provides authority for the construction and maintenance of buildings in the operation of these laboratories. However, the Regional Research Laboratories are carried in the present bill as a subappropriation item within the Bureau's main-head appropriation, and thus under the House language might be subject to the $15,000 limitation which was intended to apply only to the subappropriations for "General administrative expenses," "Agricultural chemical investigations," and "Naval stores investigations," as has been the case for a number of years. The buildings which have been erected for the Regional Research Laboratories cost approximately $5,600,000, whereas the value of the other buildings owned by the Bureau outside of the District of Columbia, to which the $15,000 limitation has heretofore applied, is less than $100,000.

While the construction of the main buildings of the Regional Research Laboratories has been completed, minor construction, repairs, and alterations necessarily will be required from time to time as an integral part of the facilities essential to the prosecution of the research program. Such requirements are in excess of the amount that would be available under the $15,000 limitation. The committee, therefore, recommend a limitation of not to exceed $7,500 on the cost of erecting any one building, and further recommends a limitation on the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year not to exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater.)

Agricultural Research Administration—Continued.

Beltsville Research Center:

Limitation on alteration of buildings:

The committee recommend that the following language in the bill be amended as indicated:

, including maintenance, operation, ~~construction,~~ *construction* or alteration of necessary buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500 ~~for any one building~~, repairs,

(The House language grants authority for alteration of buildings, but because it is associated with the authority for construction of buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500 for any one building, the authority for alteration of buildings would not be operative in the case of any building costing $7,500 or more. This is because the limitation of $7,500 has been interpreted to mean that the cost of construction plus the cost of alterations of any building may not exceed $7,500. The Beltsville Research Center has laboratory and office buildings, a granary and service buildings costing in excess of $7,500 and thus has need for authority for altering them should the demands of the work so require. The committee, therefore, recommend that the provision be amended as shown above. The effect of the proposed amendments are to provide an over-all limitation of not to exceed a total of $7,500 for construction and alteration of buildings at the Beltsville Research Center.)

Total, Agricultural Research Administration	$1,182,588

Forest Service:

Forest management	15,000
(The committee recommend this increase as an additional amount for work on the spruce budworm. As passed by the House, the bill contains an appropriation of $10,000 under this heading for work on the spruce budworm.)	
Range investigations	10,000
(The committee recommend this amount for research in converting cut-over Douglas fir land to grazing.)	
Forest products:	
For work on utilization of southern hardwoods	20,000
(The House allowed $15,000 for this purpose. The additional amount recommended by the committee is to provide a total of $35,000 for this work during the fiscal year 1945.)	
Forest products investigations in the Northeastern States	35,000
Total, forest products	55,000
Forest economics	10,000
(This amount is recommended for economic studies conducted by the Allegheny Forest Experiment Station in the anthracite forest region. In proposing this amount for the fiscal year 1945, the committee expects that this project and reports thereon shall be completed by the end of the fiscal year 1945.)	
Forest-fire cooperation	3,770,938
This increase recommended by the committee will provide during the fiscal year 1945 the same amount as was appropriated for the current fiscal year.	

Forest Service—Continued.

The committee recommend that the following proviso be added to the bill:

: Provided, That the Secretary may authorize expenditures not to exceed $1,000,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners

The committee recommend that the following provision be added to the bill:

including also not to exceed $50,000 for the study of the effect of tax laws and the investigation of timber insurance as provided in section 3 of said act,

(In recommending the addition of this language to the bill, the committee expects that this study and investigation will be completed by the end of the fiscal year 1945, and that likewise the reports thereon will be completed by that time.)

Total, Forest Service $3,860,938

Emergency Rubber Project:

The committee recommend that the following language be deleted from the bill:

including the cost of progressive and final liquidation of all of said project during the fiscal year 1945,

The Budget estimate proposed the continuation of the Emergency Rubber Project during the fiscal year 1945 on a maintenance basis, including the construction and operation of one additional processing mill at Bakersfield, California, and for continuation of the research programs on guayule and cryptostegia. It proposed that not to exceed $5,420,000 of the unobligated balances of appropriations made for this project for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 be reappropriated to finance the activity during 1945. The bill as passed by the House proposed a reappropriation of $3,952,585 of such balances, and provided for progressive and final liquidation of project during the fiscal year 1945.

The committee recommend that the bill provide for the continuation of the program as contemplated by the Budget estimate, but that a reduction of $931,600 be made in the reappropriation proposed by the House, thus providing for a reappropriation of $3,020,985. This action will result in the same amount of funds being available as were proposed in the Budget estimate, since there will remain on June 30, 1944, an estimated unobligated balance of approximately $2,399,015 in the 1944 fiscal year appropriation which is available until expended.

In approving the same amount of funds for the fiscal year 1945 as proposed by the Budget estimate, the committee expects that not more than one additional processing mill will be constructed at a cost not to exceed $400,000.

War Food Administration:

Agricultural wage stabilization 400,000

The committee recommend that the following proviso be deleted from the bill:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a substantial number of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration

War Food Administration—Continued.

Administration of food distribution orders financed by assessments $1,100,000

The committee recommend that the following proviso be amended as indicated:

: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products, *excepting walnuts*, for administration of such orders

Total, War Food Administration 1,500,000

Commodity Credit Corporation:

Salaries and administrative expenses:

The committee recommend that the limitation on the amount of the Corporation's funds to be available during the fiscal year 1945 for salaries and administrative expenses be increased from $5,458,526 to $7,208,526, or an increase in the limitation of $1,750,000, which is $152,800 less than the increase proposed in a supplemental Budget estimate contained in Senate Doc. 179. The amount recommended is for the administrative expenses of the dairy-production-payment program. The fact that the committee has allowed this increase in the funds requested for the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be construed as approving any subsidy program now in effect or hereafter to be promulgated by this agency.

The committee recommend that the following proviso be amended as follows:

: *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–8) *; and the method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for ⅞-inch middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for ⅞-inch middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this proviso*

The committee recommend that the following proviso be amended as indicated:

: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substantially deteriorated in quality (*or in the case of perishable commodities if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks*) or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses

Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources .. 12,500,000

(The committee recommend this amount for additional payments on an acreage and pound basis for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes determined by the War Food Administrator to be necessary for an adequate supply of such seeds. In view of the great shortage of the supply of these seeds,

Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources—Continued.

officials of the Department of Agriculture believe that the situation clearly demands that some steps be taken to encourage the production of an adequate supply, and the committee, accordingly, recommend that funds in the amount of $12,500,000 be made available for this purpose.)

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill:

: *Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944

(At the hearing, representatives of the War Food Administration stated that this proviso is unnecessary in the 1945 act inasmuch as the legislative directive contained in the 1944 act has been complied with. The 1944 act authorized the formulation and administration of a 1944 program of soil-building and soil and water conservation practices. Pursuant to the authority contained in the 1944 act, the A. A. A. designed such a program, and no provision was made in the 1944 Agricultural Conservation Program bulletin for any incentive or crop adjustment payments. Inasmuch as payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 are not enumerated or set forth in the bulletin of February 9, 1944, the committee has approved the recommendation of the War Food Administration that this proviso be stricken from the bill.)

Salaries and other administrative expenses:

The committee recommend that the limitation on the amount for salaries and other administrative expenses be increased from $24,250,000 as proposed by the House to $25,000,000 as provided in the Budget estimate. The committee also recommend that the following language be deleted from the bill:

; but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred

The committee recommend that the following language be amended as indicated:

: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, and ~~like~~ programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended,

(It was represented to the committee that the inclusion of the word "like" before "programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended", would apparently prohibit the use of this appropriation for the formulation and administration of marketing quotas on flue-cured and burley tobacco for 1945 which have been specifically authorized and directed by Congress in House Joint Resolution 234.)

Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources—Continued.

The committee recommend that the following language be stricken from the bill:

; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State Committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States

The committee recommend that the following proviso in the bill be amended as follows:

: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1944 ~~and 1945~~, *1945 and 1946* programs under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended;

(The Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, provided authority to make advance purchases of conservation materials and services for making grants under three programs; namely, the 1942, 1943, and 1944 programs, and at the same time, amended the "Conservation and use" item in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so that the amount appropriated thereunder would likewise be available for such purchases and grants in the 1941, 1942, and 1943 programs. The Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, provides that conservation materials may be purchased to be used as grants under the 1943, 1944, and 1945 agricultural conservation programs. This change was necessary due to the fact that in certain sections of the country programs started at an earlier date—in some States as early as July 1. In other States the programs start during the early fall. It was pointed out at the hearing that it is advantageous to negotiate for the purchase of conservation materials and services before the commencement of a program in order that such materials will be available for distribution for application in the late summer and early fall. The amendment recommended by the committee will enable the Department to purchase, out of the 1945 fiscal year appropriation, conservation materials and services for use in connection with the 1946 agricultural conservation program.)

The committee recommend that the following proviso be deleted from the bill:

: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or con-

Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources—Continued.

tributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in activities designed to influence the action of Congress with respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except that employees may furnish to Congress any information authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by Congress, or by any of its committees or members)

The committee feels that if there is need for amending the Hatch Act, which prohibits political activity on the part of Government employees, and the Anti-lobbying Act, which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for lobbying activities, that the matter should be considered by the proper legislative committee, and that any changes proposed should be made equally applicable to all Departments and agencies of the Government. The Comptroller General in a letter to the Committee under date of April 1, 1944, made the following statements relative to the administrative and accounting problems that would be encountered in endeavoring to administer the proviso recommended to be deleted from the bill:

"Aside from the question as to whether, in view of the existing statutory provisions hereinbefore quoted, the enactment of the proposed limitation on the use of appropriations is necessary or would serve any useful purpose, I desire to invite your attention to the administrative and auditing problems that will be encountered by the Department of Agriculture and the General Accounting Office if such a provision should be enacted.

Under both of the quoted existing statutes, administrative action is required to remove an employee from the service in the event of violation of the inhibitions before payment of his compensation is prohibited (19 Comp. Gen. 834), whereas under the proposed restriction on the use of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture there would have to be determined prior to payment of compensation to any full-time employee of the Department of Agriculture whether such employee has or has not engaged in the activities described in the provision. Unlike the appropriation restrictions relating to subversive activities and to citizenship which provide that an affidavit of the employee will constitute prima facie evidence that the conditions necessary to authorize payment exist, nothing appears in the proposed appropriation restriction here involved to indicate the nature of the evidence to be required either by the Department of Agriculture or by the General Accounting Office to determine that the employees involved have not engaged in the inhibited activities. Consequently, if such a provision should be enacted the General Accounting Office could not allow credit for any payment made to a full-time employee of the Department of Agriculture in the absence of a certificate by an authorized certifying officer of the Department of Agriculture to the effect that the employee concerned had not, during

Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources—Continued.

the period covered by the payment, engaged in any of the activities described in the provision. Also, since the authorized certifying officers are personally liable under their bonds when any facts or statements to which they certify are not as represented, they, no doubt, would require, as to each pay roll or voucher presented to them for certification, that each employee at least execute and file an affidavit after the close of each pay period and before the voucher covering such pay period is certified for payment, to the effect that none of the inhibited activity had been engaged in during such period. Obviously, such requirements would involve an enormous amount of additional work and would cause considerable delay in the making of payments of compensation to the employees of the Department of Agriculture."

The committee recommend that the following proviso be deleted from the bill:

: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person, who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity

In a letter under date of Apr. 25, 1944, to the committee, the Comptroller General likewise called attention to the administrative and audit problems that would arise in endeavoring to carry out the foregoing proviso, which is recommended to be stricken from the bill:

* * * if such a provision should be enacted the General Accounting Office could not allow credit for any payment made from any appropriation contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, to the Secretary of Agriculture or any other person for salary, per diem or expenses in the absence of a certificate by an authorized certifying officer to the effect that such person, during the period covered by the payment, had not personally or by letter demanded that any farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity. Also, since the authorized certifying officers are personally liable under their bonds when any facts or statements to which they certify are not as represented, they, no doubt, would require, as to each pay roll or voucher presented to them for certification, that each person to whom payment is proposed execute and file an affidavit after the close of each period covered by such payment and before the pay roll or voucher is certified for payment, to the effect that such person had not made any such demand. Obviously, such requirements would involve an enormous amount of additional work and would cause considerable delay in the making of payments to the officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture."

Federal Crop Insurance Act:

Administrative and operating expenses:

(The committee recommend that the amount of the reappropriation of $100,000, as proposed by the House, be increased to $420,000. It was represented to the committee that this additional amount will be needed for liquidation expenses during the fiscal year 1945, if the interests of the Government are to be properly protected.)

Soil Conservation Service:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be deleted from the bill:

: *Provided further*, That in any case in which a State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district,

Section 32 funds:

The committee recommend that the following provision be added to the bill:

To enable the Secretary to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said Act shall be available to the Secretary for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32 in a sum not exceeding $50,000,000: Provided, That such funds shall be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1945 without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration.

Marketing Service:

Market news service:	
Livestock market reports, Baltimore, Md	$2,000
Dairy and poultry market reports, New Orleans, La	2,000
Total, Marketing Service	4,000

Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation 28,265,000

(The committee recommend that the amount authorized to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for loan purposes be fixed at $96,710,000.)

Farm Tenant Act:

Salaries and expenses $750,000

(The committee recommend that the amount authorized to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for loan purposes be fixed at $20,000,000 in lieu of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House.)

Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas 1,025,000

(This appropriation is estimated for under the item "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation." In providing for a separate appropriation under the act of Aug. 28, 1937, the committee has reduced in a like amount the funds recommended under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation.")

Rural Electrification Administration:

Salaries and expenses 200,000

Loans:

The committee recommends that the $20,000,000 direct appropriation proposed by the House for loan purposes be deleted, and that funds be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for loan purposes by the Rural Electrification Administration. The committee recommends that for the fiscal year 1945 the amount to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be fixed at $40,000,000.

Total increase 49,537,526

DECREASES

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources 40,000,000

(The committee is recommending this reduction in the appropriation and will propose an amendment contained in the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1945 making available under this heading $40,000,000 from funds appropriated under section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved Aug. 24, 1935.)

Rural Electrification Administration:

Loans 20,000,000

(In recommending the elimination of the $20,000,000 direct appropriation proposed by the House, the committee is recommending that funds be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for Rural Electrification Administration loan purposes. For the fiscal year 1945, the committee is recommending that this amount be fixed at $40,000,000.)

Total decrease 60,000,000

Net decrease 10,462,474

Amount of bill as reported to Senate 524,781,718

○

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE 78th-2nd, No. 88
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDING OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(Issued May 18, 1944, for actions of wednesday, May 17, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....12
Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations.....1,3,4,5
Bureaucracy.....20
Census of agriculture....4
Education.....19
Flood control.....7
Flood relief.....3
Food distribution.....10
Food production....9,10,18
Foreign trade.....8,24
Gasoline.....9
Land acquisition.....15
Lands, public.....26
Loans, farm.....13,19
Machinery, farm.....11
Organix Act of 1944....1,2
Post-war planning.....1,16
Price control.....21,29
Priorities.....31
Rationing.....9,30
Reclamation; irrigation.17
Selective service.....32
Taxation.....6
Transportation.....28
Veterans.....13,19
Water conservation...14,17
Wildlife.....25,27

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945. Passed with amendments this bill, H.R.4443 (pp. 4658-84).

AGREED to all committee amendments (pp. 4658-80) and those by Sen. Russell, Ga., to provide for the salaries of the heads of BAE, ARA, and FS (p.4680); to authorize the War Food Administrator to approve travel expenses of intermittent employees to and from their homes or places of business (p.4680), and to transfer not to exceed $40,000,000 of Sec. 32 funds (Total not to exceed $290,000,000) to the Conservation and use of agricultural land resources item (p.4681); by Sen. Murdock's (Utah) amendment to the committee amendment to increase to Range investigations' (FS) item to $323,475 (pp. 4683-4); and by Sen. Overton, (La.) to authorize WFA to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 ACP program with respect to any farm if the War Food Administrator determines that the producer would have been eligible except for failure to file the ACP form before June 30, 1943 (p. 4684).

REJECTED, 24-42, Sen. Danaher's (Conn.) amendment to the AAA item to recuire Department employees to certify as to non-participation in political activities (pp. 4663-75). Sen. Chavez' (N.Mex.) amendment appropriating $5,593,830 for post-war planning for forestry was ruled out on a point-of-order raised by Sen. Vandenberg, Mich. (pp. 4681-3).

Sen. McKellar, Tenn., commended the reduction in the amount of appropriations (pp. 4659-60). Sens. Ellender, La., and Russell, Ga., discussed the reduction in the soil-conservation payment item (p. 4660). Sen. Russell explained the agricultural-wage stabilization item (pp. 4660-1), the deletion of the so-called "anti-lobbying" provision (pp. 4661-2), and the conferees' (on H.R.4278, the Organic Act of 1944) action concerning the Senate FSA amendment (p. 4678).

2. ORGANIC ACT OF 1944. It is understood that the conference report on this bill, H.R. 4278, will be filed in the House today, May 18; that the report will be taken up Tues., May 23; and that conference report (in regards to the Senate amendments) provides for a school-lunch program for 2 years (same as passed the Senate) and for FSA loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation for 1945 (Senate

amendment had included 1946); and that reports the tobacco provision in disagreement.

3. FLOOD RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to conference report on H.J.Res. 280, to provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by 1944 floods or windsotrms (pp. 4685-6). For provisions of the conference report, see Digest 87. This measure will now be sent to the President.

4. STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed with amendments this bill, H.R. 4204 (pp. 4657-8). Agreed to the committee amendment providing for a census of agriculture (p. 4657). For other provisions of this bill, see Digest 30; Sens. McCarran, McKellar, Russell, Bankhead, Connally, White, and Reed were appointed conferees (p. 4658).

5. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President supplemental estimates of appropriations amounting to $18,496,188.36 for Interior which includes $8,000,000 for liquid fuel investigations (p. 4652).

6. TAXATION. Finance Committee (during recess) reported with amendments H.R. 4646 to provide for simplification of the income tax (H.Rept. 885) (p. 4652).

Sen. La Follette, Wis., submitted an amendment relating to deductions from gross income which he intends to propose to H.R. 4646, to provide for simplification of the income tax (p. 4653).

7. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Taft, Ohio, submitted an amendment which he intends to propose to H.R. 4793, to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods (p. 4653). This amendment was discussed later (pp. 4675-7).

8. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the Attorney General and the Alien Property Custodian a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 4652.)

9. GASOLINE; FOOD PRODUCTION. Sen. Reed, Kans., inserted constituents' letter protesting the scarcity of materials and the waste of gasoline and time used in obtaining these items and its consequent effect on food production (p. 4653).

10. LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted constituents' letters criticizing the recent corn-freeze order (pp. 4653-4).

11. FARM MACHINERY. Sen. Langer, N. Dak., criticized exportation of farm machinery and inserted a Times-Herald editorial on this subject (pp. 4684-5).

12. ADJOURNED until Fri., May 19 (p. 4686). Majority Leader McCormack, Mass., announced that H.R. 4646, that tax simplification bill, and H.R. 4414, the Legislative-Judiciary appropriation bill will be taken up Fri., May 19 (pp. 4684-5

HOUSE

13. FARM LOANS; VETERANS. Continued debate on S. 1767, the GI Bill of Rights (pp. 4691-712). During the debate on this bill Sen. Brooks, Ill., discussed the farm-and-home-loan provision (p. 4711).

14. WATER CONSERVATION. Received Interior's report on conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. To Irrigation and Reclamation Committee. (p. 4715.)

and a half ago one of the most highly advertised motion pictures coming from the propaganda factory in Hollywood brought before the American people a glamorous story of the achievements of Mihailovitch. In the past day or two we have heard that there are possibilities of Mihailovitch being recognized by our Russian ally. One day we hear that it is Tito who is to be recognized, and the next day we understand that it is to be Mihailovitch. Certainly the American people are getting no true picture of what is going on in foreign countries, such as is published in British magazines and newspapers.

It seems to me that the foreign policy of the United States should be stated and firmly adhered to. We are in this war, and we are going to be victorious; but we should let our people, who are making the tools of war and paying the taxes, our boys who are in the thick of the fighting, our allies, and our enemies, know at what point we will consider that victory has been won. It is our moral obligation as a nation to do so. We should stop the confusion which exists by reason of changing our policies from month to month, so that the American people and the boys who are fighting the war may know exactly where we stand and exactly what we intend to do, and whether we intend to stand by the Atlantic Charter or whether we are going to change that policy when the war is won. If we do change the policy, and come out of the war with the same status we had, before the war is over I am sure the repercussions in this country and throughout the world will be very great.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 4204 making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Office of the Secretary of State," on page 2, line 3, after the name "Secretary of State", to strike out "$7,700,000" and insert "$10,340,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 9, after the word "fixtures", to insert "purchase of uniforms"; in line 11, after the word "services", to insert "and services for the analysis and tabulation of technical information and the preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$26,000", and in line 18, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$388,000" and insert "$538,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$260,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Service," on page 10, line 10, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,700,000" and insert "$3,754,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census," on page 57, after line 24, to insert:

Census of agriculture: For all expenses necessary for preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quinquennial Census of Agriculture of the United States, including the employment by the Director, at rates to be fixed by him, of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; construction of tabulating machines; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the collection of statistics, when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary; printing and binding; $7,250,000, to be available until December 31, 1946, and to be consolidated with the appropriation "Census of Agriculture" contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," on page 59, line 6, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$2,130,000" and insert "$2,459,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 17, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$3,765,000" and insert "$4,715,000"; and in line 22, after the word "fund", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $950,000 of this amount shall be available for the establishment of landing areas."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 10, after the figures "$23,800,000", to strike out "*Provided*, That during the fiscal year 1945 the Secretary of Commerce may delegate his authority to authorize payment of expenses of travel and transportation of household goods of employees on change of official station" and insert "*Provided*, That during the fiscal year 1945 the Secretary of Commerce may delegate his authority to authorize payment of expenses of travel and transportation of household goods of officers and employees on change of official station: *Provided further*, That in no case shall such authority be delegated to any official below the level of the directors or managers of regional or field offices."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 24, to insert:

Development of landing areas: The consolidated appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1943, shall remain available until June 30, 1945, without warrant action, and the portion thereof available for administrative expenses shall be available also for the operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft and passenger-carrying automobiles, and not to exceed $3,000 for printing and binding: *Provided*, That not to exceed $186,140 may be transferred to the appropriation "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the development of landing areas program.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board," on page 63, line 13, after "and skis);" to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,529,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 63, line 21, after the word "than", to strike out "four" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 15, after the word "For", to strike out "the".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 6, after the word "binding", to strike out "and traveling expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau", on page 76, after line 20, to insert:

Extra compensation at not to exceed $5 per day may be paid to employees of other Government agencies in Alaska and in other Territorial possessions for taking and transmitting meteorological observations for the Weather Bureau.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 17, to insert:

During the fiscal year 1945 the Secretary of Commerce may delegate his authority to the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Chief of the Weather Bureau, and the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to authorize payment of expenses of travel and transportation of household goods of officers and employees on change of official station.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer an amendment under suspension of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 10, after the word "State;" it is proposed to insert the following: "transportation and other necessary expenses in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence, of persons serving while away from their homes in an advisory capacity without

other compensation from the United States, or at $1 per annum; expenses to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, including travel in privately owned automobiles (and per diem in lieu of subsistence at place of employment), of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada explain the necessity for sending persons all over the world at $25 a day?

Mr. McCARRAN. This amendment is offered at the request of the State Department because the State Department from time to time finds it necessary to call in from the various sections of the country and from educational institutions and other institutions individuals who are especially equipped in certain lines to advise with the Secretary of State. They are not on salary. It may be in some instances they are employed on the basis of a dollar a year. They receive only $25 a day to cover all their expenses and per diem. I may illustrate from a statement sent to the committee by the Secretary of State the type of individuals who have been called on in the past by the Department. The Department in the past has called on such outstanding experts as Percy W. Bidwell, director of studies of the Council on Foreign Relations, New York; Isaiah Bowman, president, Johns Hopkins University; Brooks Emeny, director of the Council on World Affairs; Anne O'Hare McCormick, writer on the New York Times; James T. Shotwell, professor, Columbia University; Myron C. Taylor, lawyer, director, First National Bank, New York, and so forth; Jacob Viner, professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Mr. President, the Secretary of State finds it necessary to call such men in for consultation and advice on special subjects, and they receive only $25 a day for the time they are in service.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was the amendment submitted to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, yes; it was submitted to the committee, and the chairman was authorized to offer the amendment from the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on behalf of the committee, on page 3, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I also offer on behalf of the committee another amendment under suspension of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

President's War Relief Control Board: For all expenses necessary to enable the President's War Relief Control Board to continue to administer section 8 (b) of the Neutrality Act of 1939 and to perform the functions vested in it by Executive Order 9205 of July 25, 1942, including personal services in the District of Columbia; fees for professional or expert services at rates to be determined by the Secretary of State, but not in excess of $25 per day; actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes in an advisory capacity without other compensation from the United States, or at $1 per annum; expenses of attendance at meetings and conferences concerned with the work of the Board; printing and binding; purchase of books, newspapers, and periodicals; and stenographic reporting services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, $50,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on behalf of the committee on page 4, after line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill (H. R. 4204) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4443, the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Solicitor," on page 4, line 18, after the word "service", to strike out "$1,830,632" and insert "$1,930,632"; and on page 5, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,015,000" and insert "$1,063,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—Printing and binding," on page 7, line 21, after the word "in", to strike out "the" and insert "this."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 10, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,150,000" and insert "$2,181,655."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, before the word "together", to strike out "$2,325,236" and insert "$2,475,236."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Research Administration—Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 21, line 16, after the word "necessary", to strike out "buildings," and insert "buildings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, after the word "cattle", to strike out "$5,240,355" and insert "$5,433,232."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 15, after the word "authorities", to strike out "$114,288" and insert "$115,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 2, after the word "animals", to strike out "$951,253" and insert "$1,003,130."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 7, after the word "printing", to strike out "$8,616,759" and insert "$9,359,124."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after the word "animals", to strike out "$272,115" and insert "$279,228."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 16, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$37,007" and insert "$38,444."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering—Salaries and expenses," on page 27, line 11, after the name "National Arboretum", to strike out "*Provided*, That the cost of any building erected or altered, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500" and insert "*Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 19, after the word "reports" to strike out "$293,639" and insert "$378,639—of which (notwithstanding the above limitation upon buildings) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the construction of a building at the Houma (La.) station."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, after the word "control" to strike out "$645,596" and insert "$650,524."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 19, after the word "conditions", to strike out "$245,000" and insert "$257,563."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 18, after the word "storage", to strike out "$1,458,877" and insert "$1,463,877."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 19, after the word "surveys," to strike out "$290,000" and insert "$298,913."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 15, after the word "surveys", to strike out "$162,582" and insert "$174,582."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 25, after the word "handling", to strike out "$131,020" and insert "$143,520."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and Expenses", on page 35, after line 2, to insert:

Citrus canker eradication: For determining and applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $11,300: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 1, after the word "purposes," to strike out "$258,470" and insert "$283,470."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 13, after the word "arthropods," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry—Salaries and Expenses," on page 42, line 6, after the name "District of Columbia" to strike out "at a total cost not to exceed $15,000," and insert a colon and the following proviso: *Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia explain the type of buildings which the amendment will include?

Mr. RUSSELL. All the amendments in this bill relating to the construction or alteration of buildings have been made to conform to the provisions of the legislative authorization bill which recently was passed, and which places a limitation on the amount which the Secretary can expend for any one building. The amendment which is now under consideration relates to the four regional laboratories, and provides that for repairs and alterations to the regional laboratories not more than $500 or not in excess of 2 percent of the cost of the building shall be spent in any one fiscal year.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the amendment apply only to the laboratories?

Mr. RUSSELL. It applies both to the laboratories and to certain other buildings. A number of building items are contained in the bill. A new greenhouse costing approximately $7,500 is being constructed at Beltsville, Md. Provision for two or three other small buildings is made in the bill; but no building authorized by this legislation will cost more than $10,000. Nowhere in the bill is there any authorization for any building which will cost more than that amount. The most expensive building which is allowed is one costing $10,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the amendment include a possible office building for a county agent, for example?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not. No such building could possibly be constructed with any of the funds appropriated in this bill. Such a building would require a supplemental or separate appropriation. There is no provision in the pending bill for the construction of buildings for county agents.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 42, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Beltsville Research Center," on page 44, line 13, after the word "operation", to strike out "construction," and insert "construction"; and in line 14, after the figures "$7,500", to strike out "for any one building."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—Salaries and expenses", on page 46, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$887,074" and insert "$952,611."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 6, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$498,848" and insert "$513,848."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 10, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$288,475" and insert "$298,475."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 13, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$1,092,519" and insert "$1,147,519."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 17, after the numerals "10", to strike out "$74,018" and insert "$84,018."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest-fire cooperation," on page 54, line 11, after "564–570)," to strike out "$2,500,000 and in addition thereto $29,062 to carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943; in all, $2,529,062", and insert "including also not to exceed $50,000 for the study of the effect of tax laws and the investigation of timber insurance as provided in section 3 of said act, $6,300,000,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$64,226" and insert "$84,381."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 19, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the Secretary may authorize expenditures not to exceed $1,000,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia explain what is contemplated within lines 19 to 23 on page 54?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to undertake to do so. At the present time in the agricultural appropriation bill there is an appropriation of $2,300,000 for this same purpose. The sum allowed this year represents a reduction in the amount of $1,300,000. A great many of the critical war plants, including plants designated as secret by the War Department, are in rather remote and isolated areas. The War Department has made arrangements to combat fires within the plants. The plants have fire engines and machinery and other equipment of that kind; but no provision has been made for protecting those plants from fires which may occur in the forests surrounding them. They are not located in national forests. The forest lands around them are privately owned. But as a matter of protection to these war plants, Congress has now, for 3 years, appropriated funds in order that they may be safeguarded against destruction by fire.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 54, lines 19 to 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that the bill just passed by the Senate, carrying appropriations for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, as reported to the Senate, was $20,655,478 under the appropriations for 1944, and $5,073,000 under the estimates for 1945. In other words, there is quite a reduction in the appropriations for the coming year compared to what they are for the current fiscal year.

With respect to the bill now under consideration, the agricultural appropriation bill, I find, from page 1 of the report, that this bill, as reported to the Senate, is under the appropriations for 1944 by $363,787,665, and under the estimates for 1945 by $12,959,755.

This is splendid work, Mr. President, done under the direction of the excellent chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and those who serve on the committee with him. I wish to pay my respects and my compliments to the Senator from Georgia and the other Senators associated with him on the subcommittee, for the

fine work which the subcommittee has done.

At this time I think it would be very wise to hear from the chairman of the subcommittee as to how these reductions were made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the very kind statement made by the Senator from Tennessee. Of course, much of the credit must inevitably go to him, because of the fact that he is the acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Let me point out to those who have in times past complained about the size of some of the agricultural appropriation bills that the pending bill is approximately $600,000,000 below the appropriations for the year 1942. As has been stated by the Senator from Tennessee, the bill now before the Senate would appropriate $363,787,665 less than the Congress appropriated for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year. Of course, this bill contains a great many items. Reductions have been made all along the line in the agricultural appropriations. There have been reductions in some cases in the research work for the department, which I deplore, because I consider the research work of the Department of Agriculture to be its primary function.

The two largest items of decrease are found in the elimination of parity payments to farmers, representing a reduction of $212,000,000 in the bill; and the reduction of the soil conservation payments from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000. In those two items alone, within the past 3 years the Congress has reduced the agricultural appropriations in the sum of $412,000,000. There have been smaller reductions in other items.

Of course, we have found it necessary to make small increases in certain items. Items for forest fire protection, for example, have been almost doubled since the outbreak of the war, because of the fact that forests have been subjected to unusual hazards, and because of the scarcity of manpower, making it important that the Forest Service as well as the States, through the local timber protection organizations, have available at all times personnel to combat fires in our forests.

I think I can sum it all up by saying that these reductions substantiate the statements which have been made on this floor from year to year, when the agricultural appropriation bill has been under consideration, that the relief we were seeking for the farmers of this country was not sought as a permanent part of our system of government, but that it was only sought at a time when the farmer was waging an unequal economic battle for existence, as compared with other groups in the Nation. Even today, when farm prices are not yet commensurate with the income of other groups, we have seen enormous reductions made in the agricultural appropriation bill without any loud outcry or protest from the farming population of the Nation. It is an additional tribute to them, to their independence, to their courage, and to their spirit of individuality.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago the distinguished Senator stated that the amount of appropriation for soil conservation was reduced by over $200,000,000. Why such a large reduction? Is it that the farmers are not participating in the program to the same extent as in the past?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; not at all. There was a higher percentage of participation last year than in previous years. It came about by the reduction in the amount paid per acre for reducing acreage which grew out of eliminating marketing quotas on wheat and cotton.

Soil conservation payments have been retained in about the same proportion, and approximately $300,000,000 in this bill is for soil conservation payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 4, after the word "projects", to strike out "including the cost of progressive and final liquidation of all of said project during the fiscal year 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,952,585" and insert "$3,020,985."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 16, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$29,200,000" and insert "$30,700,000."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia for an explanation of the item in line 16, page 59, just read by the clerk, calling for an expenditure of $30,700,000 for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles for the War Food Administration. For the average low-priced car, that would mean approximately 30,000 automobiles.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I fear that my friend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has not read all the language. The allowance for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles, to which he has referred, is only a small part of the proposed total expenditure. In a few minutes I shall be happy to tell the Senator the exact number of automobiles contemplated to be purchased, but the amount appropriated provides for all the work of the War Food Administration, including personal services, the purchase of typewriters, traveling expenses, and all the various items which go into the operation of the War Food Administration.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say further to the Senator from South Dakota that at the present time the War Food Administration in the District of Columbia has only two automobiles, and it does not contemplate purchasing new ones during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from South Dakota interrupted with the question which he propounded, because the language to which he referred struck me as being peculiar when it was first read by me in the committee. Of course, when it is examined in connection with all the other items in the bill which affect the War Food Administration, it is seen that only an infinitesimal part of the total appropriation applies to automobiles. I can understand the Senator's feelings with regard to the number of automobiles being used in the various departments.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I recall that the Senator from Tennessee had something to say on that subject last year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 59, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 4, to strike out the words "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization" and insert "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a substantial number of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia for an explanation of the italicized language which it is proposed to insert?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall explain to the Senator what the Committee on Appropriations had in mind.

This was one of the most perplexing questions that arose during the entire consideration of the bill. The Director of Economic Stabilization delegated to the War Food Administrator the fixing of a ceiling on farm labor. That authority has been exercised very sparingly. Last year, in one area in California, all the asparagus ripened at about the same time, and the wages of farm labor for gathering the asparagus reached fantastic levels, at some places as much as $40 or $50 a day, for labor employed in the fields to gather or harvest the asparagus. Representatives of the War Food Administration moved into the area, called a meeting of the producers, and a ceiling price on farm labor for the gathering of asparagus was finally agreed upon. The same thing happened in one or two other sections of the country where grapefruit and oranges, for example, were being gathered by persons to whom excessively high wages were being paid. The wage scales went out of all reason in those areas because of the fact that the crop was rotting, and in their desperation the farmers bid against one another for labor. Not only were wages skyrocketing, but laborers were spending a great portion of their time on the road walking from one place to another in order to obtain an advantage of 40 or 50 cents an hour from some other producer. Therefore, in those isolated cases the War Food Administrator undertook to fix a ceiling on wages to be received by farm laborers. There was no protest made to the committee that this power

had been abused. The other House thought that the program should be carried on somewhere else than within the War Food Administration, and they asked, therefore, that the proviso which has been read be inserted in the bill.

There was some confusion about the matter, and some of the farm organizations became exorcised because they thought the Administrator was undertaking to put a floor under wages. In order to prevent any confusion, and to safeguard the situation, an amendment was inserted providing that the War Food Administrator may not move into any area and fix wages unless he is requested to do so by the producers.

Of course, Mr. President, I realize that the language is not as definite as it might be. I have given a great deal of thought to the matter, and I do not see how we could have drafted it with more clarity. It contains the language "a substantial number of producers," and I realize that is more or less a nebulous expression. However, I do not see how we can establish a definite percentage of producers unless we define the area of production, and that cannot be done because there might be some citrus producers in one State and some in another. There might be an acute situation with regard to asparagus in one county, and no difficulty would be encountered with regard to the spiraling of wages until we moved into some other county. Therefore, we endeavored to safeguard the producers against the establishment of a floor under wages. However, I think the matter should be within the jurisdiction of the War Food Administration. I think it could be administered more sanely there than in the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate the explanation the Senator has made of this matter; but the language is a little confusing to me, because it leaves in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the power to determine what a substantial number is. He might determine that half a dozen farmers constituted a substantial number.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am not interested so much in the ceiling the Senator has explained. I gather after reading this provision several times that it was the purpose to give the Secretary power to stabilize wages whenever he could get a small group to ask him to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I can assure the Senator that it will not be exercised in that way; but it is only for the purpose of placing a ceiling upon farm wages which, in instances, get out of control.

I want to say further that I think Judge Marvin Jones, who is Administrator of the War Food Administration and is a man of very conservative thought, can safely be trusted if we leave this matter in his hands.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. There was raised in the committee the same question the Senator from South Dakota raises as to the use of the word "substantial." The committee faced the alternative of writing the provision in this general and somewhat indefinite language, dependent upon the judgment and good faith of the administrative agency, or trying to write an arbitrary formula to be inserted in the statute, and when that was undertaken we found ourselves facing insurmountable difficulties.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Maine for his very lucid contribution to the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 60, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commodity Credit Corporation," on page 60, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,458,526" and insert "$7,208,526"; on page 61, in line 21, after "(15 U. S. C. 713a-8)", to insert a semicolon and "and the method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for seven-eighths of 1 inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for seven-eighths of 1 inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this proviso"; and in line 5, after the word "quality", to insert "(or in the case of perishable commodities if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", on page 63, line 5, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$290,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000."

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I should make a brief explanation of that amendment. The amount of the estimates for the coming fiscal year for soil conservation payments was $300,000,000. As submitted by the Budget, it consisted of $10,000,000 of reappropriated funds, unused last year, $250,000,000 from the Treasury, and $40,000,000 of section 32 funds, which were apparently not to be expended this year. The House of Representatives, in view of the controversy which had been going on regarding legislation on appropriation bills did not adopt the Budget suggestion to take section 32 funds—I might say that we have no evidence they would be demanded for any other purpose—but made a direct appropriation out of the Treasury. I shall offer from the floor a legislative amendment when we have concluded the committee amendments to allow the use of $40,000,000 of section 32 funds to supplement the $250,000,000 provided in the bill. If the amendment be agreed to, we will arrive at the same totals that will be available for expenditure for soil conservation payments, but the funds will be derived from different sources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 63, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 63, in line 11, after the word "inclusive", to insert "and, in addition, $12,500,000 for making additional payments on an acreage and pound basis for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes determined by the War Food Administrator to be necessary for an adequate supply of such seeds"; in line 16, after the word *"Provided"* to strike out "That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1944 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided further,*"; in line 24, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$24,250,000" and insert "$25,000,000"; on page 64, line 1, after the word "programs," to strike out the semicolon and "but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the schedule in the Budget nereunder for 1945 for transfer to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred"; in line 18, after the word "and" to strike out "like"; in line 24, after the word "program" to strike out the semicolon and "but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil building and soil and water conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States"; on page 65, line 21, after the numerals "1944" to strike out "and 1945" and insert "1945, and 1946".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 11, after the word "producers", to strike out the colon and the following provisos: "*Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicita-

tion of subscriptions to, or contributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in activities designed to influence the action of Congress with respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except that employees may furnish to Congress any information authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by Congress, or by any of its committees or members): *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary per diem allowance or expenses of any person, who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to have the Senator from Georgia tell us why the Senate committee has stricken out the House language which would have prohibited political activities by the A. A. A. agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. There were two reasons why the committee struck this rider from the bill. In the first place, the rider, insofar as it affects political activities, was absolutely unnecessary. Most Senators are familiar with the provisions of the so-called Hatch Act which apply to every department and agency of the Government and every employee of the Government. I will read for the benefit of the Senate the provisions of the Hatch Act in order that they may see the similarity between the proviso inserted by the House and the existing law:

It shall be unlawful for any person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinion on all political subjects and candidates.

That is the substantial part of the Hatch Act which the Congress enacted in 1939.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Did the committee have any evidence before it that any of these A. A. A. officials or employees have ever been prosecuted under the Hatch act for violation of the act?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; we did not have any evidence of that kind, but we did have evidence to show that a number of employees of the A. A. A. had been discharged for political activity, including one important case which arose somewhere in the Northwest.

I want to continue with my reading of the Hatch Act:

Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him.

That is the penalty which is in the existing law, and is the same as the penalty carried in the House provision.

The latter part of the proviso, as will be evident to all Senators who have read it, relates to lobbying or promoting legislation and taking up matters with the Congress. I think this proviso goes much further than the Congress ought to go, because it undoubtedly infringes upon the right of any employee of the Government to petition the Congress for redress of any grievance. Under the proviso adopted by the House, if an employee of the Department of Agriculture should write to a Senator or to a Representative a letter referring to a bill pending before the Congress which might affect him, he could be summarily dismissed. So the right of petition is undoubtedly abridged by the provision, and it is wholly unconstitutional.

I read now the lobbying statute which is already in effect, to show that there is absolutely no reason for singling out the Department of Agriculture for a rewriting of the law relating to political activity or lobbying. I read now from title 18, United States Code, section 201, a statute enacted in 1919:

Hereafter—

That means until the act is repealed—

Hereafter no part of the money appropriated in this or any other act shall in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

I think certainly that goes far enough. It says that a man cannot lobby, but he is not forbidden communicating with a Member of Congress.

I wish to say, in this regard, that some of the most valuable suggestions I have ever received to assist me in my service on the Committee on Appropriations have come from employees of the Department who were away down in the ranks. I have had them write me and say that such and such work was absolutely useless, perhaps at a time when the head of the Bureau was before the committee asserting its importance, but from the information I received from some employee I was able to obtain knowledge that brought about reductions in appropriations, and the curtailment of the work of some of the agencies of the Government.

The penalty for violating this lobby statute is the same as that in the Hatch Act. The person shall be removed from his office, and he is also guilty of a crime, if he uses any funds of the Federal Government for these purposes which are forbidden.

Mr. President, the presentation I have made up until now goes to the uselessness of the proposed legislation, because the matter is already covered in substance by the provisions of the Hatch Act, and in the antilobbying statute.

There is a very practical reason why this amendment should be stricken from the bill. The Comptroller General, in a letter to the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], points out that it would be impossible to administer this limitation in a specific appropriation bill. He says that it would be necessary for the certifying officer to investigate every one of the thousands of employees of the Department, and certify on his own knowledge that they had not been guilty of these activities. Otherwise, the certifying officer, or the officer who handles the pay rolls in the various bureaus of the Department, would be personally liable for all funds that were paid any of the employees.

The Comptroller General points out in his letter, which Senators will find on pages 121 and 122 of the hearings on the pending bill, that this provision in the bill would require an enormous amount of additional work. I read from his letter:

Obviously, such requirements would involve an enormous amount of additional work and would cause considerable delay in the making of payments of compensation to the employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the study the committee gave this subject, and the fact that all the employees' organizations appeared before us and stated that they objected to being singled out among all the departments of the Government and have such prohibition leveled at them, in view of the fact that it was already covered in the Hatch Act, and in the antilobbying statute enacted in 1919, and in view of the report of the Comptroller General that it would require an immense amount of work and additional personnel and expense to attempt to enforce any such prohibition, the committee eliminated the provision from the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. One of the most cogent reasons why the amendment should not be adopted is that one department was singled out. The antilobbying statute is a very important statute, and one which is being quite constantly abused and violated by some of the officers of the Government. But that is no reason for singling out one department, the Department of Agriculture, from all others, and applying such a rigorous statute to it, while leaving the others out.

On the other hand, if there is any trouble about the present antilobbying statute, it can easily be amended. The general statute on the subject to which the Senator from Georgia has referred could easily be amended, and that would be the way to remedy any defect in the present law. I am not sure but that the present statute should be remedied somewhat, but not in an appropriation bill singling out one department for action.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no real reason for applying this re-

striction to the Department of Agriculture alone. Charges have been made of political activities on the part of employees of the Federal Government in all the departments, and undoubtedly there have been some cases in which individuals have violated the Hatch Act. I do not think there is any question about that. But I might say that from the investigation we were able to make, when these facts were brought to the attention of the officials of the Department of Agriculture they moved as swiftly and as drastically as the heads of any other agencies of the Government.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it is obvious that this committee amendment is one which, in part, deals with political activities, and that runs down to line 24, on page 66, and the other part deals with lobbying activities, and involves the matter of the right of petition. Since there are two separate subjects before us, I move that the question be divided, to the end that we may proceed first to consider the part of the committee amendment which commences on page 66, in line 24, with the words "or engaging in activities."

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to know where the division is proposed to be made.

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be happy to point out to the Senator from Georgia. It commences in line 24 with the words "or engaging in activities designed to influence the action of Congress," and so forth. It will be my purpose first to move that the Senate concur in the committee's recommendation in that particular, once we vote that the question be divided. I move that the amendment be divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right, and the amendment will be divided.

Mr. DANAHER. I now move that the Senate concur in the committee amendment commencing in line 24 with the words "or engaged in activities designed to influence the action of Congress", down to and including line 10, on page 67.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think we can reach the objective the Senator has in mind by proceeding in an orderly manner. The amendment has been divided, and we can proceed to act on the two questions.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does not the Senator agree with me that the so-called antilobbying portion of the amendment should be agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to be perfectly frank. I think the antilobbying provision is much more vicious than the other, because undoubtedly the antilobbying provision here is unconstitutional. I do not think we can put such a restriction on the inherent rights of American citizens. Both of them are bad, but the antilobbying clause is worse.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree with the Senator, and that is why I wish to get it out of the bill. I therefore move——

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to make a motion. The amendment having been divided, the question automatically comes on agreeing to the committee amendment in each case.

Mr. DANAHER. Whether necessary or not, I move that the Senate proceed to act on the committee amendment commencing on page 66, line 24, down to line 10, page 67.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to be technical, but I make the point of order that the vote comes upon that part of the amendment already divided, and a motion to concur is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DANAHER. The question has been divided, Mr. President, and I now address myself to page 66, lines 11 to 24, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair suggest that the proper order would be to dispose of the first part of the amendment, as it has been divided at the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it has been divided, and I understand the Chair so to rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. I now move an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the amendment is in order.

Mr. DANAHER. The amendment which I now offer will read, commencing in line 11:

Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee unless such employe shall certify that he has not engaged in any political activity including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or contributions for, the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.

Thus, Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered as a substitute for the first portion of the committee amendment will not place upon the Comptroller the burden of having to ascertain on his own motion whether or not political activities unlawfully have been engaged in by members of this agency. Quite the contrary, he will be permitted to make the payment upon their certifying, as they do when they sign their pay rolls, that they have not in fact engaged in any such political activity. Thus, Mr. President, we will relieve the Comptroller General of what would, I agree, be a very considerable burden on him, but we will also achieve the protection to which the public of the United States is entitled by providing that Government funds shall not be expended all over the United States, in every county, in the form of salaries to thousands upon thousands of full-time employees of this agency who thereupon could go forward in a political year utilizing their capacity and their contact with farmers everywhere to influence the result of an election.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose to ask me a question? If not, I may say to the Senator that I intended to yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask recognition to obtain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will prevail. The argument advanced by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that it is unnecessary to have this amendment in the bill because the Hatch Act takes care of the situation, of course, is true provided the Hatch Act is being enforced.

I know that this matter has been called to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture many times, for quite a period, and I know that the reason the amendment was placed in the bill by the House of Representatives was because of many violations on the part of some triple A men who go into the field and use their office for political purposes. This matter has been brought to the attention of the department in letter after letter written not only by me but by my colleagues and others throughout my section of the country, and by Representatives and Senators from different States of the Union.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to supplement what the Senator has said by endorsing every word of it, and adding that I am among those who have presented repeated evidences of this sort of political outrage at Government expense.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the senior Senator from Michigan for his statement because it corroborates exactly what I am saying.

Mr. President, I do not like to use a letter which came to me, because I have no taste for going into personal equations when it comes to politics. I never have done so, and for that reason I dislike to mention any names now; but after I had repeatedly called this matter to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture, after officials simply rode the circuit in Nebraska within the past 12 months telling the triple A men and those who belong to the program, to go out and say that Senator WHERRY did not support the program, and that they should use their influence to see that I did, and bring all the pressure they could to bear upon me, we now find that that was not enough. Here is a letter that was found after I had made the request that the Hatch Act be complied with and enforced. This letter was found—or it came to my hands, I will put it that way. The letter purports to be addressed to James C. Quigley, the Democratic National Committeeman for Nebraska. It apparently was written to him under date of December 17, 1943, and I shall read the letter into the RECORD at this point so that Senators will understand why I am so anxious to see

that the amendment is adopted. The letter is written on stationery of the United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, and is dated Lincoln, Nebr., December 17, 1943, and is as follows:

DEAR FRIEND JIM: After talking to you yesterday, I called Jim Lawrence concerning a blast at Butler as per his suggestion.

He apparently is becoming anxious to start something in a political way. He feels that so many things have been done wrongly by Butler, Miller, Buffet, and others, including Griswold—

He left me out of the picture, and I am at least grateful for that, but note—no reasons given, just blast—

that we have sufficient ammunition to awaken the people of the State to the reactionary policies of the G. O. P. at this time. He is going to outline a program in the rough for a series of broadcasts to be spotted between now and May which he feels is necessary. I mentioned the money angle, and told him that the idea was good, if we could find the money to carry it on.

In line with his thinking, I feel that possibly some pep could be built up by a couple of good lambasts at BUTLER right now. Our people are quick to react favorably after they see someone start some action, but are slow to reach into their pockets before they hear or see something that looks like it might do some good. There is no question of shortage of funds in the pockets of most people right now. That is self-evident in the amount of fur coats, jewelry, and everything that is available that is being purchased by all people. It isn't true so much of white-collar workers, but the farmer, merchant, and war-plant worker have more cash than they know what to do with. It might be well to figure out some way to get some of this surplus into the treasury of the party for political purposes this spring and fall. It is worth thinking about anyway.

Your friend McBride has made some pertinent remarks about an offensive campaign. Win or lose, it is easier to be on the offensive than to defend, either in business or politics. If you and others feel that the errors of BUTLER and others have reached a high enough point to start after them, Jim Lawrence may be right in getting started right away while the press is still carrying the news as front-page items.

I am certainly happy to learn that Mrs. Quigley is gaining.

The writer goes on respecting her personal health. The letter is signed "Sincerely yours, Claude H. Gunn."

Claude H. Gunn, Mr. President, as I am advised, is the district farm debt adjustment specialist of the Farm Security Administration at Lincoln, Nebr. We are paying that man a salary to write on Department of Agriculture stationery suggestions as to how to go out and raise money for political campaigns, and yet the statement is made on the floor of the Senate that such things will be taken care of.

Mr. President, I cannot guarantee the authenticity of what is on the yellow sheet which I hold in my hand, but this yellow sheet accompanied the letter which came to my office, and it is stated that a copy of the letter was sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and a copy was sent to Attorney General Biddle pointing out this gross violation of the Hatch Act, and yet nothing has been done about the matter, and nothing apparently is being done about it.

I wish to give the Senate some further information. I have in my hand an affidavit signed by several farmers of Polk County, Nebr. I wish to read the affidavit into the RECORD at this point:

We, the undersigned farmers of Polk County, Nebr., do hereby state that a member of the county agriculture committee has told us, each individually, that before we could get our tractor fuel for the year for farm operation we would have to sign up for the farm program.

We further state that we have signed this statement in the presence of David C. DeTurk and with the understanding that it be sent to members of the Nebraska delegation in Congress.

DAVID C. DETURK.
PAUL ROSENBERRY.
ARTHUR LONGHAMMER.
W. E. BAHR.

MARCH 27, 1944.

Immediately upon receipt of this petition I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture. I had taken the matter up before that time as well. I wish to submit other letters for the RECORD. One is dated April 1, 1944, and states that the policy referred to is still being pursued. The letter, which comes from Cambridge, Nebr., and which is addressed to me by C. A. Cotton, is as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, NEBR., *April 1, 1944.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: In reply to your request as to record, in the A. A. A. matter, you certainly are at liberty to make use of same in any way you see fit.

The three members of the committee were Earl Williams, acting chairman, and Clifford Crampton, and Oscar Joseph.

If I can assist in any other way to stop the dictating of this A. A. A. outfit which I have no use for, let me know.

Thanking you, I am,
Very respectfully,

C. A. COTTON.

He refers to a previous letter dated March 14, 1944, from Cambridge, Nebr., addressed to me, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, NEBR., *March 14, 1944.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: At a recent A. A. A. precinct meeting on or about February 16, 1944, held at the Watkins school house, Garfield precinct, Frontier County, we were advised by the A. A. A. that unless we signed up for the A. A. A. farm program, we would not be allowed any gasoline or fuel oil for our farming operations.

I never have approved of this farm program, and do not now, but I did sign this year for the reason that I could not farm my 800 acres, there being about 400 acres under cultivation, unless I did sign up so as to have the necessary fuel. I am sorry that I signed up, allowed myself to be forced to do so, I feel that one should not be forced to do so and I would sure appreciate your advising me real soon if one can be forced to sign up and if this is the only manner in which I can obtain the necessary fuel to farm.

If it is not necessary for me to sign so as to farm, I would like very much to have the papers I signed returned and have nothing whatever to do with the program. Thanking you, I am,

Your very truly,

C. A. COTTON.

I wish to say to you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, that if the Hatch Act were enforced as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said it should be—I would agree with him. I have a profound respect for the judgment of the Senator from Georgia, and I agree with him that if the Hatch Act were enforced there would be no difficulty.

But I wish further to say that from my State I have received a great many letters relating to the matter. I do not wish to clutter up the RECORD, but I can submit letter after letter similar to the one written by the triple-A man whose letter I have read, stating that the farmers had to do thus and so, or else. That is using an office for political purposes, and there is no question about it.

I had hoped the Senator from Georgia at least would think about this matter a little further. To insure the success of the farm program and the success of the triple A I think it is necessary to have strict adherence to the policy of prohibiting such activities as are complained of.

I received a letter from Secretary Wickard. He said he would take up the matter and would see that those who had done the things complained of would not continue to do them. But they are continuing to do them. This letter shows how far they are going in their efforts to use the triple-A organization as a political organization for the New Deal in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does not the Senator apprehend that the amendment I have offered will go right to the heart of the situation? As it is drawn, the individual employee simply will certify, over his signature—just as the 44,000,000 persons who file tax returns do—under penalty of perjury, that he has not engaged in political activity.

No special formality would be required. The statement could be put on the back of the check at the point where the endorsement is required. The only requirement would be that the statement be made; that is all. But in the event there is a violation we have the Hatch Act, as the Senator from Georgia has pointed out. The certification can be put on the back of the check with the endorsement of the individual payee.

Mr. WHERRY. I am speaking in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. When I had reference to the amendment offered in the House committee, I was giving its history, hoping that the Senate committee would accept it.

When the Senator from Georgia makes his final remarks, I shall ask him to answer this question: What difference would it make if the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut were adopted? It might be said that it is unnecessary, but it certainly would do no harm. If it would help the triple A to say to them that they must adhere to the policy that the Secretary says he has already outlined, the amendment would be just that much of an advantage. I cannot see anything wrong with the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut,

or any reason why it should not be adopted. I have pointed out constructively what I think is required.

I do not want to take too much issue. If the Hatch Act were being enforced, there would be no need for the amendment in this particular case. But I wished to call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that something must be done. The situation is not being handled under the Hatch Act. It is not being handled by the Secretary of Agriculture. Some of the triple A men are going throughout my State, using that organization as a political organization. The letters I have read are merely samples. I have many other letters which show how far they have gone in the attempt to work in a political way for what I call the New Deal organization in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, supplemental to what has been said in the debate, I wish to call attention to the hearings on this bill before the committee. On page 257, I find the following language:

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. O'NEAL there is one other question I want to ask you.

Do you know what brought forth this amendment here? I notice you endorse it in your report—to put the Hatch Act on lobbying activities in here. I was just curious to know what occasioned that amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will tell you what it was.

I think it was last year, the A. A. A. committeemen got very active out in the midwestern area particularly, and I know they wrote to Congressmen and threatened Congressmen, and they got really politically very active. There is certainly plenty of proof of that. The House Members themselves showed me more than I realized, and our leaders would tell me.

In Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, under the auspices of the A. A. A., they would have these big mass meetings and call in necessary A. A. A. representatives. So what they were trying to do with this amendment is really put the Hatch Act into effect.

It looked like the Hatch Act was not very effective against lobbying.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think in justice to Mr. O'NEAL it should be said that he stated that Secretary Wickard "fired this fellow who was in charge of the A. A. A." So the man did lose his job. The Senator from South Dakota read down to that point.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me point out that what the Senator from South Dakota has read pertains to lobbying activity, not to the amendment I have offered.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield now to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. He has already admitted that the activities about which he has talked are prohibited by the Hatch Act. I am opposed to murder. It is forbidden by the laws of my State. I do not think it is necessary to adopt a Senate resolution to declare against murder.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I answered that question when he was not on the floor of the Senate. If we can insert at this point in the bill the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, so that all the Triple A men will have to certify that they have not engaged in political activity, I think it will put teeth in the law which will prevent this kind of political activity in Nebraska, which no doubt is also taking place in the State of the Senator from Missouri. Every United States attorney appointed by the President would help enforce this provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska why he does not come forward with another amendment covering every other activity in violation of the Hatch Act?

Mr. WHERRY. That would be all right with me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We all know that the postal employees lobby here constantly—the postmasters, the postal carriers, and everyone else. Why does the Senator from Nebraska undertake——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is talking about lobbying. That comes in the next amendment. Lobbying is not covered in the amendment which we are discussing. We are talking about the first amendment, and it is now under consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. The word "lobbying" appears in the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. It is not in the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The same principle is involved.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. The pending question is on agreeing to my amendment. My amendment has entirely eliminated the words "or lobbying." They are not in the amendment. There is no question about lobbying, so far as my amendment is concerned. It refers only to political activity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question of lobbying cannot be left out of consideration by the Senate, because the Senate committee amendment strikes it out. The Senator is offering a substitute for it. That still leaves the question of lobbying before the Senate, for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, but the amendment in itself has been divided, and lobbying will be taken up in the next section of the amendment. I had hoped there would be no controversy about this amendment. I cannot understand why the Senate of the United States should object to writing in the bill the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

I should like to have had the original amendment which came from the House. I cannot see any objection to it. This activity is not being reached by the Hatch Act. Certainly, I have given the Senate ample evidence of the actual situation.

I see the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] on his feet. I do not know how he feels about this matter. But I have received a letter about the situation in Kansas, and I shall read one paragraph from it. It is dated March 20, 1944:

This evening over WIBW, Topeka, Kans., radio the announcer, or, rather, newscaster, stated that Governor Schoeppel, of Kansas, is receiving complaints from farmers in counties that they, when going to the A. A. A., are told they have to sign and take out land from production or else no gasoline for farming.

That word comes from Kansas. The man who made the statement on the radio does not live in Nebraska. But if Senators wish to have more evidence along that line, I can present hundreds of letters showing that certain Triple A officials are riding the circuit, using their office for political purposes. I think that is a violation of the Hatch Act. I think it is not being handled under the Hatch Act.

I have taken it up with the Department of Agriculture, and I think the only result we have had is what the Senator from Georgia mentioned. One or two men were discharged; but the practice is still being continued. Perhaps the time has arrived when we should say, when we enact a law, what is in the act, and then, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has suggested, add a postscript and tell the people of the world that that is what we mean. I mean that the A. A. A. should not engage in political activities at the expense of the Government, riding up and down Nebraska and forcing its will on the people.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator that charges such as he has been making are very easy to make. Similar charges have been made in my own State with regard to the O. P. A., which was set up under the sponsorship of a Republican Governor. In my own county, St. Louis County, where I have lived for 20 years, it is freely charged that the local rationing board, set up under the responsibility of Governor Donnell, will not give anyone any additional gasoline unless he can show his Republican connections. I believe that the proper way to handle that matter is to make a complaint to the responsible agency, which I have done. I do not believe the Senator is justified in undertaking to make a blanket indictment of the Democratic Party by something which he cannot prove.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have presented the evidence to prove what I have said. The Senator has no evidence. He is merely making a bald statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator presented three or four letters from partisan Republicans. That is all he has done. That is all he can do.

Mr. WHERRY. I presented a letter from the director of the A. A. A. organization in the State of Nebraska, written to the Democratic national committeeman, Mr. James Quigley, of Valentine, Nebr. If that is not evidence, I do not know what it should be called. I also presented a letter from C. A. Cotton, of Cambridge, Nebr., and, in addition, an affidavit signed by four men from in and around Osceola, Nebr. Similar facts were also reported over a Kansas radio station. How much more evidence is needed to satisfy even a reluctant mind?

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield the floor to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot yield the floor to another Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Chair's pardon. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think this is a question that could be very readily resolved. There is no great difference between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and myself.

Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Nebraska that, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with this subject, we discussed the question at some length in the subcommittee.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, there was no evidence of any consequence before us of any violations. We had newspaper reports, and whatever is of common knowledge, but there was no evidence before the subcommittee.

As the Senator from Georgia may recall, in the subcommittee we first discussed the proposal submitted by the Senator from Connecticut. We recognized the impossibility of the Comptroller and the financial agents of the Government administering this provision under the language as it came over from the House. That would be utterly impossible. An employee could not receive his pay until every possible question or finding of fact had been resolved, which would be an impossible situation.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that the committee amendment ought to be divided into two parts, which has been done. Obviously the part of the amendment beginning in line 24 relates to another subject, which will doubtless be dealt with when we reach it.

Upon the question immediately before the Senate, I appeal to my good friend the Senator from Georgia. This is a solution that we can and should accept, and I hope he will agree. I share his feelings that it is a little embarrassing at times to single out any agency and apply this test. The other side of the question is that in my section of the country the A. A. A. has been very active. I have no doubt that in Nebraska it has committed all the sins the Senator from Nebraska says it has committed. The Senator from Missouri will remember that 4 years ago some question arose with regard to the activities of the A. A. A. in Missouri and Iowa. I happened to be on the so-called Gillette committee that year, dealing with campaign expenditures.

No one has a greater concern that I over the agricultural activities being carried out; but I wish to see them carried out fairly, freely, without bias, and without partisanship. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge upon my friend the Senator from Georgia, in charge of the bill, that he, on behalf of the committee, agree to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must say to my friend from Kansas that I would have no right to agree to any change in what the committee has done even if I were disposed to do so.

Let me say further that I cannot support this amendment because I think it would indict all the employees of the Department of Agriculture for what may have been done by a very few employees. I would not favor such a provision. I do not believe in singling out any one department in this manner because two or three of its employees may have been guilty of some abuses, and indicting the whole department by putting such a limitation upon it. I could not vote for it.

I voted for the Hatch Act. I am proud of the fact that the Hatch Act originated with a Democratic Senator, and was passed during a Democratic administration, to tie the hands of Democratic employees in political activities. I say that as one who has tried his best to keep this bill free from any partisan discussion ever since I have been in charge of it. I very much regret any discussion which has the tinge of partisanship in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill, because I have never considered that it should be a political or partisan bill. I do not think it is fair to the Department of Agriculture to single out that one Department because, forsooth, three or four employees may have violated the Hatch Act, any more than it would be fair to indict all the residents in a certain apartment house because someone in that house might be guilty of murder.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. As the Senator from Georgia stated in answer to my earlier question, he has no evidence of any of these persons being prosecuted at any time under the Hatch Act, in which he voices such pride.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I believe that in the main the Hatch Act covers all the things complained of. I also believe that the Hatch Act has been observed more in the breach than in the enforcement. If a simple certification by the employees that they have not engaged in any political activities—and such certification would require no particular effort on the part of anyone—would meet the objection of the Senator from Connecticut, as well as the one which I made in the committee that it would be impossible to administer this law as it was written, I think a very fair solution of the problem would be reached. It would meet the rather widespread and undesirable criticism which has attached to some of the activities which have been referred to. The criticism has been made to my deep regret, because I wish the best of success to the persons who have to administer the important duties which come to them.

So, Mr. President, I shall conclude with the statement that I find no objection to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Connecticut. I think it is a solution of the difficulty. It meets the objection which has been raised, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut as a substitute for the first branch of the committee amendment on page 66, line 11.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have consulted with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who is in charge of the pending bill, and I have obtained his consent to bring up another matter provided unanimous consent of the Senate can be obtained. I refer to House bill 4793, which has been messaged to the Senate from the House of Representatives. It provides for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, the other day I introduced an identical bill which was reported from the Committee on Commerce and is now on the calendar. The occasion for such a bill, Mr. President, is the fact that an extraordinary flood has occurred in the Mississippi Valley, in the Illinois Valley, and in certain other valleys in the Midwest. The floods have broken some very essential levees, and unless those levees can be repaired before the occurrence of the usual floods which take place in the latter part of June or the first of July, millions of acres of the most productive farm lands in the United States will be rendered unproductive this year.

Representatives of the Corps of Engineers have advised the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, as well as the Commerce Committee of the Senate, that there will be a race against time as to whether the levees can be repaired in time to prevent the destruction of all the land which will be planted in the meantime before the ordinary floods take place in June and July. Therefore I feel justified, with the permission of the Senator from Georgia, in asking unanimous consent that the

pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4793.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, is the Senator from Missouri asking for the consideration of Senate bill 1887?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am asking unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4793, which is an identical bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, with regret I must object at this time. I do so because a Senator on this side of the Chamber wishes to offer an amendment to the bill. I know nothing as to his ultimate attitude.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator object to disclosing the identity of the Senator to whom he refers? It might be that we could work the matter out.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said to me that he was obliged to be absent from the floor for a while, and I therefore make the objection at his suggestion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I may say to the Senator from Maine that if what he states is the situation I do not believe there is any chance of us being able to agree.

Mr. WHITE. As I have said, I know nothing of the ultimate attitude of the Senator from Ohio, but at his request I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut as a substitute for the first branch of the committee amendment on page 66, line 11.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I observed a few moments ago, I regret that anything of a partisan nature has arisen in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill. So far at least as the committee is concerned, which has dealt with this bill in the Senate, never in the 10 years I have handled these matters has a single question ever been determined by the committee on anything even approaching a partisan basis.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have served with the Senator upon the subcommittee of which he is chairman. I wish to confirm and emphasize everything the Senator has said. I am a Republican, and he is a Democrat. I never heard a partisan note from him, and I never observed a single partisan act on his part.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his testimony.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I do not believe that it can be said that this amendment is entirely without political significance. I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the language of the amendment. In the first place, it affects only the full-time employees of the Department of Agriculture. We all know that the committeemen to whom reference has been made, who are riding up and down the roads, as it has been stated here, are elected by farmers within the several counties. Therefore, in a Republican county where there was a Republican committeeman, the committeeman could proceed in any way he wished and he would not be affected by the pending amendment, because the amendment purports to deal only with the full-time employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Would such a man as the one to whom the Senator has referred come within the Hatch Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer the Senator's question. I do not remember the Hatch Act clearly enough to give an answer. However, the Hatch Act has been abandoned by the Senator from Connecticut. Why should he refer to the Hatch Act when he has walked off and left it? He says it is not effective, and therefore, by proposing restrictions, the like of which has never been seriously proposed before, he seeks to apply them only to the employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's extreme statement indicates the weight to which his argument is entitled.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator may draw any conclusion he chooses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can remember back to the Hoover administration when the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Philp, came to Missouri and made a speech to the postmasters of Missouri in which he informed them that if they did not get busy and carry the State for the Republicans they would all be dismissed. It seems to me that it comes with bad grace from my dear friend, the Senator from Connecticut, to undertake to make it appear that the Democrats are using such things as the A. A. A. for political purposes. I should like to have my friend read the speech of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Philp on the responsibility of Republican postmasters to get out and get busy—it being in violation of the civil-service laws—or be discharged from their places.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Allow me to point out to my distinguished friend from Missouri that the amendment which came over to us from the House was adopted by the whole House in which a majority of the administration party is in control; that the House amendment not only forbade all A. A. A. activity to a far greater degree than my proposed amendment, but the amendment even barred all lobbying activity by the same persons. So, if the Senator from Missouri finds any comfort in his statement, very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that the Senator from Connecticut is any less zealous in promoting political legislation than same Member of the other body. However, even he admits that the amendment which was adopted by the other House was unconstitutional, and he is now attempting to keep as much of it which may prove to be constitutional as he can.

Mr. President, I want to say that we hear about all this activity in politics from our friends on the other side of the aisle only in years when they are out of power. I do not recall that the Republican Senators ever endeavored to secure the adoption of an amendment or the passage of a bill that would prevent political activity on the part of any employees of the Federal Government so long as they were in the majority, and had charge of the Government and the power of appointment. Whatever may be the defects of the Hatch Act, if this matter is to be discussed on a partisan basis, as a party man I must observe that the Democratic Party is entitled to credit for passing an act which attempted to deal with political activities of Federal employees at a time when that party was in power and had control of the appointment of the employees. So much cannot be said for our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Now, let us look at this amendment for a moment. In the first place, it goes far beyond the Hatch Act. Under the amendment if an employee of the Department of Agriculture who is a personal friend of a Member of Congress or a member of the State general assembly or of the county clerk should contribute voluntarily, without solicitation so much as 5 cents to a campaign fund he would be immediately and summarily discharged from his position. I submit that the Congress of the United States is going too far when it undertakes to say to an individual in this country "You cannot hold public office if you contribute as much as a dime to a political party or to an individual, regardless of the office for which he may be a candidate."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator that if the individual employee in fact can be spared from the necessity of making such political contributions he will surely thank us.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the Hatch Act—and that matter was discussed when the Hatch Act was here—which prohibits a man from contributing voluntarily to a person in a political campaign. That is not a criminal activity and there is no penal provision in the law affecting it.

The Congress is going a long way when it undertakes to segregate a particular employee from all his fellows and say if he even contributes to the campaign for member of the council in the city where he lives, when the candidate may be a

personal friend or even a near relative that he shall forfeit or be discharged from his position.

The activities which have been adverted to here on the floor occurred some time ago, as I understand; I do not know how recent any of them were. I know that Senators did not bring any of the evidence before the subcommittee. The only witness before the subcommittee who mentioned this provision was Mr. O'Neal, the president of the Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. O'Neal stated that the man that he was principally concerned about who had been active in politics in the West had been discharged from his position.

A number of witnesses appeared in opposition to this measure and employees of the Department of Agriculture and the employees' organizations of the Department of Agriculture, which I believe are not conducted on a strictly partisan basis, came before the committee and protested as they had a right to protest, against being singled out, put in a special category of Federal employees, and condemned without a hearing, without evidence having been submitted to the proper committees of the Congress on which to predicate a verdict of condemnation. They are entitled to be treated as are all other Federal employees. We ought not to stigmatize the great mass of employees of the Department of Agriculture because, perhaps, in Nebraska or some other State some one of them has violated the Hatch Act.

If the Hatch Act needs to be strengthened it should be done by statute. If we are going to change the law to prohibit a man from even contributing to a campaign in a county or a township, it ought to be done by amending the statute, and not in such a fashion as this, when no evidence has been produced, other than letters which have been read on the floor by Senators, to sustain a wholesale indictment of the employees of the Department of Agriculture. I think it is infringing on the rights and liberties of the individual American citizen, whether employees or not, when it is proposed to enact a law that they cannot even express their opinion in political campaigns and cannot contribute even to local elections. I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There were rather extensive hearings held in the House on this measure, were there not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not been able to find them.

Mr. WHERRY. I was asking the Senator a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; there were not. It was only referred to by the president of the Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the action of a triple A county official demanding that farmers join the triple A program in order that they may get fuel oil is a violation of the law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have the Senator explain what he means by joining a triple A program. I do not understand it, and I should like to have the Senator explain to me what he means by a farmer joining the program.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator know what a triple A program is?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but there is no such thing now as joining a triple A program.

Mr. WHERRY. For the last 2 or 3 years they have been endeavoring to have the farmers join, especially when they had limited acreage, even if they did not like the program. Whether I am a Republican or a Democrat is beside the question; this is not a political matter. What I want to see is that a farmer, regardless of his party, may farm his farm the way he wants to farm it, and not have his activities directed from Washington. That is the program that I am opposing; and I say that neither a triple A chairman nor the director in Washington has the right to make a farmer of Nebraska subscribe to such a regimented policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska can kick a dead horse around with more sound and fury than any man I have ever known. There has been no compulsory program in Nebraska for 2 years. Yet the Senator talks of forcing farmers to join a triple A program.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say that on January 1, 1942, there was provided a penalty on wheat farmers if they did not enter into the incentive program under the triple A. I say to the Senator that is one case where compulsion was tried. Am I right or not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I just observed that the Senator from Nebraska was kicking a dead horse, for the program has not been in effect for more than 2 years, and when it was in effect it was approved by three-fourths of the farmers producing the particular commodity, otherwise it would never have gone into effect. The program, I repeat, has not been in effect for 2 years and, therefore, I say the statements in the amendment are entirely beside the question. The question boiled down is, whether the Senate of the United States wants to single one agency of the Government and indict all the employees of that agency and convict them without a hearing, without having an opportunity to defend themselves, without pursuing the normal channels of legislation, but by attaching a rider to an appropriation bill and thus depriving them of the rights and liberties which are enjoyed by other employees of the Government of the United States and by all the people of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some of the instances referred to by the Senator from Nebraska involved county committees, as I understand. They would not come either under the language of the House bill or the language of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. They are not full-time employees of the Government and the Department of Agriculture at all; they are members of the county committees. So any county committeeman, under any proposal that is now pending, could indulge in the very practices to which he referred and we could not do anything about it, because they are not included in the full-time employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wisconsin, I think, was on his feet first and I yield to him, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not have a copy of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut; I understand copies are not available; but as I heard the amendment read and as I understand its terms, even if triple A committeemen were full-time employees, the activities about which the Senator from Nabraska has complained would not be covered by the amendment. It has nothing to do with the prevention of any alleged coercion to induce other farmers to join any kind of a program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not the pending amendment, but there is a subsequent amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But it is not in the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; not at all. It would not be effected by this provision.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is my understanding.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think this amendment ought to be voted down and be dealt with in a normal legislative way. I appeal to Senators to adopt that procedure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Brewster	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bridges	Hayden	Stewart
Burton	Hill	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Tunnell
Byrd	La Follette	Tydings
Capper	Langer	Vandenberg
Caraway	Lucas	Wagner
Chandler	McCarran	Walsh, Mass.
Chavez	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Weeks
Connally	McKellar	Wheeler
Cordon	Maloney	Wherry
Danaher	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Ferguson	Nye	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have just come onto the floor, and have been somewhat interested in the debate now proceeding. I have read with much interest the amendment now being considered, but have just read it for the first time, and I am a little confused as to what it means. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question, if I may. I know he has given consideration and study to the amendment.

I notice that under the terms of the proposal any political activity is forbidden under penalty of the person being deprived of salary. "Political activity" is not defined. I take it the casting of a vote in the coming election would be a political activity under the pending bill. Am I correct? I am asking for information.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. I do not think there is any question that under the amendment, if a man should exercise the right of suffrage, he would be denied the right to receive his compensation. Casting a vote is certainly political activity.

Mr. HATCH. If the amendment should be included in the law, the Congress of the United States would penalize a man the cost of his salary if he voted in any election.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would certainly be my construction of that provision. There is no definition whatever, and certainly voting is the very essence of political activity. Voting is the ultimate aim of all political activity.

Mr. HATCH. As I have said, I have only casually examined the amendment. I cannot conceive Congress passing a bill which would deprive people of the right to vote. If that interpretation is correct, my mind is made up now.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask to modify the amendment by striking out in line 17 the words "making or."

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that in the Senator's amendment?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment is not available so that line 17 does not mean anything.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator will turn to the bill on his desk, at page 66, in line 17, he will find the words "making or", and the amendment pending has simply excised that particular page and has been appended to a separate sheet. So I ask that the words "making or" be deleted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask unanimous consent that in line 15, as it appears in the bill on the desks of Senators, the words "full time" be stricken out. Then it will meet the objections of Senators who have thought it applied to county agents other than those who were employed full time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be further modified so to make certain that it will have no retroactive effect. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has very aptly pointed out to me that it would not be advisable to have a cut-off date, because everyone has engaged in political activity at some time or other. I therefore ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by inserting the words "since June 1, 1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the amendment as modified be restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be stricken out, down to and including the word "office" on line 24, page 66, it is proposed to insert "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any employee unless such employee shall certify over his signature that he has not engaged since June 1, 1944, in any political activity (including but not limited to soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or contributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office)."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] a question or two, if I may.

In view of the fact that this amendment has just come up suddenly, and without affording us a chance to read it, I should like to have the Senator, as the author of the Hatch Act, state whether in his opinion Congress should pass a law affecting farmers, when as a matter of fact oil men, bankers, and insurance men, are getting subsidies from the Government. They can take part in politics, under the Hatch Act. Is not that true?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give us any reason why farmers should be discriminated against?

Mr. HATCH. No; I cannot.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has referred to the act sometimes spoken of as the Hatch Act. That act applied to all employees in the executive branch of the Government, with certain exceptions, policy-making officials and employees of that kind. There was no attempt made in that act to discriminate as between or among different employees in the executive branch of the Government. The attempt was made to place them all upon exactly the same basis.

When I asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] whether political activity included the right to vote I was very much in earnest, because I think voting is a political activity. So strongly did the various committees of the Congress, both of the House and of the Senate, entertain that belief that in each one of the bills which was passed language was included setting forth that nothing in the act should be construed to affect the right of an employee to vote as he might choose. There is, however, no such exception in the language of the proposed amendment. I very sincerely believe that very likely it would prohibit an employee of the Department of Agriculture from voting in an election, and I was asking for information. I wanted to know if the language would have that effect. If the Congress is about to do such a thing as that I would like to know what the frame of mind of Congress is. We might have more such legislation one of these days.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I recall, the Hatch Act, which I supported, as the Senator knows, not only did not deprive an employee of the right to vote, but it expressly accorded to him the right to express his views.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes; and I never thought that was necessary, because I believed he had that right anyway.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the language now proposed would deny him even the right to express his views.

Mr. HATCH. I think the proposed language would.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from New Mexico to say that he construes the language of this amendment to the end that an employee of the Department of Agriculture would not even have the right to vote?

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I just glanced at the amendment, but that is the first thing that struck my mind. What is political activity? Is not voting political activity? What does the Senator from Illinois say about it? If voting is not political activity I do not know what it is.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that voting is certainly a political activity. There can be no question about that. But I wonder what we are coming to in this country. I have seen the Congress of the United States deny the soldiers the right to vote. And now are we coming around to the point where we are going to deny the right to vote to those engaged as employees of the Department of Agriculture, many of whom are farmers serving on triple A committees?

Mr. President, I have found in my section of the country that less political activity exists in connection with the triple A than any organization of which I know. The fact of the matter is that the majority of the committeemen in Illinois are Republicans. I have never heard the charge made against any committeeman, at any time, whether they were Democrats or Republicans, of having attempted to play politics. It seems to me to be going a long way for a Senator to read a letter or two bearing upon some particular political activity in his section of the country, and hope to convince the Senate of the United States that an amendment of this kind, far-reaching as it is, should be adopted on the basis of that kind of proof, especially in view of what the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said a while ago. There was no evidence of any kind submitted before the committee, which held lengthy hearings upon the subject. We are dealing here with the individual rights of citizens, and it seems to me that when the individual rights of a citizen

are properly considered we went much too far in passing the Hatch Act.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I say that with all due deference to my good friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I was just going to recall some of the arguments the able Senator from Illinois made on the floor of the Senate at the time the Senate considered the measure, that it was unconstitutional.

Mr. LUCAS. I still think so, and if the act ever comes before the Supreme Court I am confident with respect to what the Court will do with the Hatch Act.

Mr. President, much politics has been thrown into this whole matter. During all the years the Republicans were in power in Congress they never sought through the adoption of such a measure as the Hatch Act to deprive the individual citizen of the inherent right given to him by the Constitution of the United States. Now they come along in an election year with this sort of proposal that strikes primarily at honest and responsible farmers. I shall be interested to see what the Republican Party will do at its convention to be held in Chicago, with respect to the triple A.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator pointed at me.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I have the right under the Senate rules to point to the Senator if I want to, without asking him a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I know what was done recently in Chicago with respect to the farm program, and I know what some of the farm leaders said to the Republicans with respect to the triple A. The Republicans are not going to disturb the triple A in their platform when they meet in convention in Chicago. The Republicans are not going to turn the black acres loose forever, as some of them would seem to suggest. The Senator from Nebraska conveniently forgets that when the black acres were turned loose prior to 1933 the more that was produced the less was obtained for the product.

The American farmer is in excellent financial condition. His progress can be traced directly to the triple A.

Mr. President, I am anxiously awaiting the time when the Republicans will hold their convention at Chicago, to see what they will do with the fundamentals of the triple A. The act is on the statute books to stay. No leaders of agriculture, whether they be Democratic in their thought or Republican in their thought, are going to do away with that act. No one will propose to do away with it unless blind partisanship prevails. Such a course will be ruinous to the individual or the party that adopts it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, among the questions the Senator from Illinois propounded, he asked, Has it come to pass that the Congress wants to deprive citizens of the right to vote? In answer to that question I am going to say for Members on both sides of the Chamber, for Republicans and Democrats alike, I do not believe there is a single Member of the Senate, or of the House of Representatives, for that matter, who would knowingly pass a law depriving citizens of the right to vote. But, Mr. President, I think that perhaps we are about to do that thing unknowingly and unwittingly. That is the reason I raised the question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me there has been a great deal of discussion among Senators who have never read the regulations promulgated by the various departments under the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act does not deprive any citizen, whether he is a Government employee or not, of the right of belonging to a political organization, of attending a political meeting, of contributing, if he so desires, to a political campaign, or of expressing his opinions freely in any way he may see fit, so long as he does not do it in a public meeting.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that a great deal of the heat and the agitation against the Hatch Act comes about by reason of the fact that a great many persons have never read the Hatch Act and have never read the regulations promulgated under the Hatch Act. It may be that the Hatch Act was a mistake and should be repealed, although I fought very strenuously, as the Senator from New Mexico knows, in behalf of its passage. But if any attack is to be made on the Hatch Act, we certainly should know what the Hatch Act provides and what the regulations under it have meant.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. REED. In the first place, Mr. President, I promise the Senator from New Mexico that I shall not make a speech on his time. I merely wish to call attention as a member, first, of the subcommittee, and secondly, of the full committee which had charge of the bill, that the Senator from Illinois treated the question as one in connection with which the Senate committee had nothing before it—something coming out of thin air or the blue sky.

The Senate committee had before it this amendment, which had been agreed to by a coordinate body of the House of Representatives. In my judgment, this amendment reached us in impossible shape; that is all.

The Senate has a duty to pass upon this question. I have regarded the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut as a fair adjustment of the views of those who have dealt with the question.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had just started to say that it is possible that the Senate is about to pass legislation for which no Senator would vote if he understood its effect. That situation, Mr. President, arises by reason of the way the legislation is before us today. It is legislation upon an appropriation bill. That is an exceedingly bad way to legislate on any subject.

I do not know anything about the merits of the particular amendment, or about what has given rise to it; but I know that an amendment of this nature, if it has any merit at all, could well come in the form of a bill which would be referred to the proper committee, where hearings would be held upon it, so that the full force and effect of the measure could be understood.

Regardless of what the Senator from Missouri has said to the effect that the so-called Hatch Act may have been a mistake, I wish to reiterate my faith and belief in that act. I do not think it was a mistake. I think it has served a very useful purpose, and is serving one today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not mean to intimate that I thought the Hatch Act was a mistake. As the Senator knows, I supported it very actively.

Mr. HATCH. And very ably.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not mean to say that I thought it was a mistake. I say that irrespective of whether the Hatch Act was a mistake, people should understand what is in it.

Mr. HATCH. I also think it is entirely constitutional. I would welcome a test in the courts. I would welcome a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States as to the powers of the Congress to legislate with respect to employees of the Government.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Earlier in the day I asked a question of the Senator from Georgia. He could not give me an answer to it. Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico can. This is the question: Has there been any prosecution, anywhere, under the Hatch Act?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Where?

Mr. HATCH. One in the State of Arizona, and one in the State of Illinois, as I recall. I understand that some of those cases are on appeal.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator knows of only two cases; does he?

Mr. HATCH. I think there have been more than that.

Then, Mr. President, I wished to point out another matter. Unless the proposed legislation goes much further than perhaps some persons think it does, it is absolutely unnecessary. If it is designed to prohibit only the ordinary political activities of employees of the Department of Agriculture, those are already prohibited by the Hatch Act. The amendment does not enlarge in any way upon the penalties provided by the Hatch Act. Under that act any person employed in the Department of Agriculture—because it is a branch of the executive departments—who engages in political activity is automatically discharged, or should be, just as he would be denied his salary in this instance. The penalty is the same.

Again, even without the Hatch Act and without this bill, when the distinguished Vice President was the Secretary of Agriculture, rules and regulations were adopted in that particular Department, if I am not mistaken—and they are in force and effect today—absolutely prohibiting political activity by those employees and by members of the

A. A. A.; and, further, those rules and regulations provided for the discharge of persons engaging in the prohibited activities.

If the thought behind the amendment is to prohibit political activities by employees of any branch of Government, I am in thorough accord and sympathy with that thought. But I am not willing to go to the length of denying to any citizen employed in any branch of the Government the right to exercise the right of suffrage.

Mr. RUSSELL. Or expression of opinion.

Mr. HATCH. Or expression of opinion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I may say there is no question that the amendment is being leveled solely at the Department of Agriculture because today the Senate has already passed an appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. That bill was passed by the Senate in just a few moments, and no question was raised in reference to it. No such amendment was offered to that bill.

The amendment is offered to single out the employees of the Department of Agriculture, to indict and convict all of them, including county committeemen working for a few days at $3 a day, and to deny them the right even to express their opinion in the local communities or townships or counties in which they live.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, in the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, no such question arose, because in connection with those departments no such notorious condition exists. That is why we did not offer to that bill such an amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of Senators to the provision on which they are about to vote. If Senators wish to say they desire to go to the length to which this amendment possibly does go, and probably does go, that is for them to say. But I think we should know and understand the effect of the legislation we vote to enact.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think there is any justification on earth for us to discriminate against farmers who happen to be members of some of the local committees, as against all the other Government employees in the country?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, the Senator knows that I think, and have long believed, they all should be on exactly the same basis.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sure the Senator does.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think we can lay down any rule which discriminates and still be fair or just to anyone.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was very sure that was the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico, but I wished to bring out from him an expression as to the pending amendment, which does distinctly discriminate against any farmer who happens to be a member of the local committees.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Even a Connecticut farmer.

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be happy to continue to yield to the Senator from Missouri if he wishes to have me do so.

Mr. President, let me now point out that we are dealing primarily with a House bill on which the whole House of Representatives has acted. The House of Representatives took account of the situation. That was done by a House of Representatives composed of 435 Members. The Members of the House of Representatives acted with full knowledge of the situation in their respective districts. In the House of Representatives the majority finds its adherents among the administration forces. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is a member of the Democratic Party. Every committee in the House of Representatives is organized under the leadership of the Democratic Party.

There is no question about what is involved in this amendment. Undoubtedly in some States there are Republicans who are members of the A. A. A. Undoubtedly in some States there are Democrats who are members of the A. A. A. The House of Representatives provided—

> That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full time employee who engages in any political activity or lobbying activity.

The House of Representatives knew what it was talking about. We know what it was talking about. The House of Representatives was not denying those persons the right to vote. The House of Representatives knows very well that Congress has no power to deny anyone the right to vote. The House of Representatives knows very well that this measure would not deny anyone the right to vote.

The House of Representatives said, when it referred to political activities or lobbying activities, that it also meant to include, although it was not limiting its definition to that—

> making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office.

They knew very well what that meant. Mr. President, the House found the situation in the country to be such that it even said that no part of these funds was to be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee of the Department of Agriculture or any of its branches, who engaged in any lobbying activity; the House went that far.

Mr. President, we have divided the question. We have confined ourselves solely at the present time to the first 10 or 12 lines of the House language. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has brought in a committee amendment which would strike out that House language. The proposed substitute now at the desk does no more than say that any such employee shall certify, at the time he is paid, that he has not engaged in the political activity mentioned. There is no question about the denial of the right to vote. We could even put on the back of the check, as Senators who are lawyers have seen time and time again in their experience, a statement which, when the endorsement of the payee appears, constitutes an agreement or certification.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator says there is no question of the denial of the right of a man to vote. Why does the Senator say that? Does he think that voting is not a political activity?

Mr. DANAHER. We know that voting is the exercise of the right of franchise. We know that political activity in connection with stimulating people to vote in a given way, lawfully or unlawfully, or soliciting campaign funds, or trying to bring about the defeat or the election of a given candidate—all such things are political activity. Surely the Senator from New Mexico knows that.

Mr. HATCH. I know that those things are political activities; but I do not know that voting is not a political activity. That is the reason I asked the Senator the question.

Mr. DANAHER. It is not political activity within the meaning of the language here proposed.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator think that is clear?

Mr. DANAHER. I not only think so, but I so assert. The legislative history back of an act of Congress is looked to by the courts when they seek to interpret it. If there should ever be a question about it, I am willing that any court may look at the RECORD of this very date and see what I have said.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator also knows that it is the practice of courts not to look at the debates on the floor of the Senate in ascertaining the Congressional interpretation.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from New Mexico knews very well that there is no question of the denial of the right to vote involved in this language.

Mr. HATCH. I have stated that the Senator had no such intention. What I wish to know is, Are we doing something we do not intend to do?

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, no.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, no Member of the Senate is more anxious than I to see effective legislation adopted to prevent pernicious political activity on the part of Government employees, or any other citizens of this Republic, and to prevent any abuse of power on the part of any employee of the Government.

I supported the Hatch Act. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that it was wise legislation. I think it has had a very salutary effect in restraining the activities which it was designed to prohibit. But let us be frank. We are

dealing here with previous rights of citizenship. We should not enact any legislation which would impinge upon the rights of citizens of this country, whether they be employees of the Government or not.

The Senator from Connecticut is not the author of the language. He asserts that it is the language adopted by the House. It is no comfort to me to have him state that the language does not on its face deny to a citizen employed by the Department of Agriculture the right to vote.

So far as I can ascertain, Mr. President, there was little consideration given to this provision in the House of Representatives. There was very little testimony before the House committee on the subject; and yet we are now being urged to accept language adopted by the House of Representatives under those circumstances. I think it could clearly be construed to deny to employees of the Department of Agriculture not only the right to express their opinions concerning candidates or issues in campaigns, but also the right to vote; for it is obvious that the language does not contain any definition of the term "political activity." The particularized activities contain a statement which is designed to prevent them from being taken as a limitation upon those two words. The language is as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or contributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.

It is clear, Mr. President, that there is no definition of the words "political activity" contained in this amendment. It is further clear that in delineating the activities which are to be prohibited, the words "including but not limited to" have been inserted in order that the language may not be construed as having limited the application of these two undefined words.

Mr. President, we are entering upon dangerous ground when we attempt to deny to citizens of the United States their inherent right to freedom of speech and freedom of expression. It is my interpretation of this language that if any employee of the Department of Agriculture were to make a statement concerning any candidate for office, he would be subject to the charge that he has engaged in political activity, and would be liable to be discharged from his position. In this day and age is the Government of the United States to adopt a provision which would deny to citizens employed in one of the branches of the Federal Government the right to freedom of expression? If we have reached that stage, Mr. President, we have come to a pretty pass.

It seems to me that this is a proposal to burn down the barn in order to get rid of a few rats. It is proposed to deny to thousands of upstanding American citizens employed by the Department of Agriculture under penalty of loss of their employment, rights which are guaranteed to them under the Constitution of the United States.

If this amendment were adopted, I think very effective use could be made of it by our enemies in exposing our hypocrisy in advocating the fundamental principles of democracy and being willing to defend them on the battlefield, while at the same time, because it is alleged that some employees have been guilty of some political activity, we deny to a large group of citizens rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States. If certain employees have been guilty of pernicious political activities, let them be prosecuted under the Hatch Act. Let an investigation be made, and let the persons charged with such activities have an opportunity to defend themselves. If it be found that they have indulged in any such activity I shall join with the Senator from Connecticut, or with any other Senator, in seeing that effective action is taken to separate them from the pay rolls, or to see that they are prosecuted under the Hatch Act.

I again assert, Mr. President, that we are treading upon dangerous ground. We are moving in the direction of denying to citizens at this time, when they are making tremendous sacrifices in both blood and treasure in order to defend the country, the right of freedom of expression, or, perhaps, even under a technical interpretation of this language, the right to vote.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator referred to bills relating to pernicious activities. I think he will find that the word "pernicious" appears in all legislation, and in the civil-service rules forbidding political activities. It all relates to pernicious activity, and even the word "pernicious" is dropped from this amendment.

I wish to say further that when the Senator points out the danger of enacting legislation involving the loss of the freedom of speech and the right to vote, it is lightly brushed aside by some in this Chamber as though we could not pass such legislation. It is easy to see that no act of Congress can limit the right of a citizen to speak freely. That right is guaranteed by the Constitution. That is true. However, there are decisions of our courts which say that while we recognize constitutional limitations this and similar legislation does not at all restrict the right of the individual to speak as he may choose to speak. No one can prevent him. However, we can say to him, "You cannot work for the Federal Government if you engage in such activities."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the point.

Mr. HATCH. The limitation is on the right of persons who work for the Federal Government, and thereby the Constitution is upheld even in those extreme cases.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is a condition of employment.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And not an absolute abridgment of the right per se. Nevertheless, the effect will be the same on the individual.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My only point is that the rights and privileges of citizens in a democracy are so precious, and have been won only after such great sacrifices, we should not enter into the delicate field of legislating with a meat ax. We should operate on this political problem with a scalpel and with full knowledge of what we are doing.

Mr. President, I believe the Hatch Act was carefully framed. I felt that I could support it because it defined the type of activity to be prohibited. It retained the fundamental rights of the citizen. I assert that a reading of the language which is here proposed will show that it is not drawn with the care with which the Hatch Act was framed. There is no definition of terms. There is no delineation of the specific activities to be prohibited as a condition of employment. As a matter of fact, the framers of this proposal were careful to provide that it should not be limited to the activities which are specified.

Mr. President, I assert that it would be shocking at this time for the Senate of the United States to go on record in favor of denying to citizens of this country the right to exercise their legitimate political rights. I repeat that it would be shocking. It could be utilized as a charge that we were hypocritical in our espousal of those precious rights and liberties. So I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will not adopt this ill-considered proposal. If there are abuses such as the Senator from Nebraska has outlined, and such as have been presented in an ex parte manner, I will join with him in doing all in my power to secure an investigation, or a prosecution of those involved.

However, Mr. President, let us not, in a moment of haste, at a time when we have not given proper consideration to this important question, rush in and do something which may make us ashamed after we have had full opportunity to contemplate the effect of our actions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for only a moment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has spoken of investigations. Unfortunately I was not present, and I did not hear what the Senator from Nebraska said on that subject. However, judging from some of the remarks which have been made, there must have been an element of coercion on the part of persons in authority, about whom the Senator was complaining. If that be true, no congressional investigation is needed. All that need be done is to go to the district attorney in the particular district in which the act is alleged to have occurred, because a violation of the provisions of the Hatch Act are criminal offenses punishable by in-

dictment and prosecution in the courts of the land.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The charges in connection with the correspondence referred to by the Senator from Nebraska were, as I understand, twofold: First, the exercise of coercion on the part of persons in the triple A in utilizing their ability to obtain gasoline for farmers in order to induce them to join some program. Secondly, there was the charge that someone connected with the Farm Security Administration had written a letter in which he urged the solicitation of money to raise a campaign fund with which to carry on political activities against the senior Senator from Nebraska, and some other persons whom I assume to be Republicans in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that it was not only the administration of the triple A and its instructions to see to it that farmers joined the triple A program in order to obtain gasoline, but in the past 6 months representatives of the triple A have made a circuit in Nebraska and required farmers to take membership in the triple A organization. They have also suggested in letters which have come to me that the farmers take up with their Senators and Representatives the matter of supporting the consumers subsidy. Such activities have been conducted on the time of the men in the Department of Agriculture, and on Department of Agricultural stationery.

I wish to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I appreciate the defense he has made against taking away rights of people to vote. I do not wish to have the franchise of the people taken away. This matter was thoroughly considered in the House of Representatives. As in the case of hearings held by committees upon which I have served with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, it is possible that a full attendance of committee members was not had, but that does not change the situation. I wish to protect the farmers against being coerced into doing things which they do not wish to do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as I said before, I will go as far as the Senator from Nebraska, if the evidence is adduced that such practices are being indulged in, to take whatever action may be necessary to bring them to an end. But I wish to point out that the amendment under consideration does not affect either directly or indirectly the cases about which the Senator is talking; they are not touched by this amendment, and no effort is made by it to reach them. I say, Mr. President, once more that this is a field into which the Congress should tread very cautiously and only after the most careful consideration. It is a field into which we have no right to enter until we have carefully considered the consequences insofar as the citizens to be affected are concerned. I certainly hope that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. In connection with the argument made by the able Senator from Wisconsin, with which I am cordially in accord, as a member of the committee which reported the Hatch Act with the recommendation for the elimination of this language, I should like to call the Senator's attention to one further illustration of how much further the provision proposed goes than the existing law. It provides that no one shall be paid any salary if he engages in certain political activities. As the able Senator has pointed out, numerous activities are enumerated, but it is expressly stated that the political activities may include others than those enumerated. It particularly forbids such employees to engage in activities designed to influence the action of Congress with respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind. Why is that not in direct conflict with the first amendment of the Federal Constitution, which provides that Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people to petition the Government for a redress of grievances?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has offered an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment. The Senator having called attention, however, to the further drastic and sweeping effect of the second portion of the House language reminds me that I wished to say when I rose to my feet, but forgot to say, that all the assurances given by the Senator from Connecticut as to the careful manner in which this language had been drawn apply only from line 11 to line 24, which he has now with a slight modification sponsored himself. The Senator from Connecticut rejects the remainder of the amendment which was adopted by the same committee and by the House of Representatives, which is the language referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island, which I think every Senator will admit is so palpably unconstitutional and goes so far in denying and abridging the fundamental rights of employees of the Department of Agriculture that the Senator from Connecticut did not want to sponsor it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word or two about the pending amendment. The Senator from Nebraska has said that this amendment was put in the bill by the House, and therefore by analogy we ought to keep it in the bill. The Senate is not bound by anything the House does in a bill. Time after time the Senate has rejected and will no doubt continue to reject, language put into a bill by the House of Representatives. That is what we are here for; we are supposed to reconsider what has been done by the House of Representatives and the House has the same right to deal with amendments or original legislation proposed by the Senate. I think the Committee on Appropriations wisely struck out this whole provision.

The Senator from Connecticut, with his usual skill, has drawn a substitute which requires any man who draws his salary either once a month or twice a month to make a certificate and sign it that he has not done any of the things prohibited by this language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator how long it will be necessary to keep the certificates. They would have to be kept until after the statute of limitations had run out and some charge had been brought for violation of the act. I presume there would be millions of certificates all the way down to the lowest committeeman in the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator's question emphasizes the ridiculous situation in which the Senate finds itself. If it adopts this amendment, before any employee could draw his pay he would be required to sign a certificate that he had not engaged in any political activities.

The Senator from Connecticut, who is a good lawyer, says all the employee would need to do would be to sign his name on the back of his check and it would be assumed that that was a compliance with the law. He would never have a chance to sign his name on the back of the check, until he made the certificate that he had not done any of these things, because he would not get a check to endorse until he had given such a certificate.

The Senator from Nebraska complained awhile ago of many of the county committees going around and trying to coerce farmers to join the program or else denying them gasoline. That is the first I ever heard of anything like that. They must have a peculiar brand of county committees in Nebraska. Certainly no county committeemen chosen by the farmers in my State have ever undertaken to coerce anybody to join a program, and the committeemen do not have anything to do with the rationing of gasoline, anyway. There are entirely different boards, working without compensation all over the United States that decide how much gasoline a man may obtain.

In order to carry out that sort of a program the county committee, under the triple A selected by the farmers, would have to go to the members of the board that disposes of gasoline and intimidate them and induce them to intimidate the farmers who come in and tell them that unless they joined the program they could not get any gasoline. But, even so, the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut does not deal with that sort of thing. It cannot be claimed that that is a political activity. It may be an overenthusiastic agricultural activity, but certainly it cannot be described as a political activity.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The facts are that in Nebraska the triple A committee designated a board to ration fuel oil for the farm tractors.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does not the Senator mean gasoline?

Mr. WHERRY. The fuel oil or the gasoline that is used by the tractors. That is a fact, and I have said so heretofore on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Kentucky says he cannot imagine such a condition and that they would have to go to the O. P. A.

Mr. BARKLEY. The rationing of gasoline is under the O. P. A.

Mr. WHERRY. In Nebraska it is delegated by the triple A.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be delegated by the triple A to some organization that has a connection with the farmers, but it still comes under the O. P. A., and they are responsible to the O. P. A.

Mr. WHERRY. That is beside the question, because it is the triple A organization that tells the farmer he must join the triple A program before he can get full oil or gasoline.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that to be true, that would not be dealt with by the amendment which is now before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it would be. I do not want to clutter up the RECORD, but I have, conservatively, thousands of communications indicating that some agencies went over the country—they can be traced by the towns they went to—asking the different farmers and committee members to write to the Senate of the United States and say that we must support the consumer-subsidy proposition. It can be said that the men who do it are the men designated as the heads of the departments by the State organization in Nebraska. I took the letter up with Mr. Wickard, the Secretary of Agriculture. He said he had called to their attention that they should not engage in that kind of activity, and that he would correct the situation, but up to date it has not been corrected.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose it is possible to point out aggravated cases of practically every law and statute being violated somewhere in the United States, but the grand juries are open to citizens who wish to complain against that sort of thing. I do not know to what extent any citizen who has such a complaint has been before a Federal grand jury and asked to be heard. Certainly citizens have that right, and no one can deny them that right. So far as the Hatch Act is concerned, the remedy does not altogether lie with the head of a department. The criminal courts are open to anyone who has a case.

If the pending amendment should be agreed to, there is not an employee of the Department of Agriculture who lives in Maryland or in Virginia, who has any number of children eligible for attendance in the common schools of those States, who has a next-door neighbor who is a candidate for school trustee, to form the board of education for a county which would employ teachers to teach the children of such employee of the Department of Agriculture, who could, without violating the law, speak a word in behalf of his neighbor, or even his own brother, if he were a candidate for school trustee. Certainly we are not expected to go to the extent of applying to one department a rule, thereby creating a caste system in the United States among Government employees, going far enough to say that certain persons cannot even express their views as to the merits and qualifications of candidates for school trustee, in a school district in any State in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is not the over-all objection to the amendment the fact that it applies to only one department? If such a provision should apply to the Department of Agriculture, should it not apply to all other departments as well? Should we single out one department, and do it in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator; it seems to me to be folly to pick out one department, and that department the one which deals with the most fundamental occupation of the American people, which is agriculture and the production of food, clothing, and other necessaries of life.

Mr. President, if the foundations of our Government are so weak and unsteady that we are afraid a few little farm committees and farm employees are going to undermine it, we might as well quit fighting for it, surrender to Hitler, and tell him to come over and take charge of it. I do not think we are ready to do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bailey	Gerry	O'Daniel
Ball	Gillette	Overton
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gurney	Reed
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Brewster	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Shipstead
Burton	Hill	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Langer	Tydings
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chandler	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Connally	McKellar	Weeks
Cordon	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the first branch of the committee amendment on page 66, line 11. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. TOBEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed by the President of the United States as a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

I am advised that if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced, would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—24

Ball	Butler	Gurney
Brewster	Capper	Hawkes
Bridges	Cordon	Millikin
Burton	Danaher	Moore
Bushfield	Ferguson	Reed

Robertson	Thomas, Idaho	Wherry
Shipstead	Vandenberg	White
Taft	Weeks	Wilson

NAYS—42

Bailey	Green	Mead
Bankhead	Hatch	Murdock
Barkley	Hayden	Nye
Bilbo	Hill	O'Daniel
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Caraway	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Chandler	La Follette	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Tunnell
Connally	McCarran	Tydings
Eastland	McClellan	Wagner
Ellender	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Gillette	Maloney	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—30

Aiken	Glass	Reynolds
Andrews	Guffey	Scrugham
Austin	Holman	Smith
Bone	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Maybank	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Murray	Truman
Davis	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Downey	Pepper	Wiley
George	Revercomb	Willis

So Mr. DANAHER's amendment to the first branch of the committee amendment, on page 66, line 11, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the first branch of the committee amendment, on page 66, line 11.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make an observation. It is my hope that as soon as the pending bill is disposed of we can proceed to consider the measures on the calendar, and can dispose of them. I hope that by pursuing that course it will be possible for the Senate to take a recess until Friday. I give that information to Senators in the hope that we shall be able to dispose of the pending bill rapidly, and then shall be able to dispose of the measures on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the committee amendment, on page 66, line 11.

The first branch of the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second branch of the committee amendment, on page 66.

The second branch of the committee amendment was agreed to.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I return to my request that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4793, which has been passed by the House of Representatives. It provides for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods. An identical bill has been reported from the Senate Commerce Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 4793.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4793) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add to the bill the following new section:

SEC. —. The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is hereby authorized to repair and reconstruct dikes and levees along the south shore of Lake Erie in the Reno-Howard farm area, Jerusalem township, Lucas County, Ohio, damaged in the extraordinary floods of July and October 1943, and to dewater and decontaminize the area affected in such manner as to make the land again suitable for cultivation in the year 1944. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purposes the sum of $265,000.

Nothing in this act shall impose upon the United States any obligation, moral or legal, to maintain the dikes and levees repaired and reconstructed in this area or in any other area unless provided for by general law. The work shall not be undertaken until there has been formed under the laws of Ohio a conservation district covering the area in question and competent under the laws of Ohio to maintain the dikes and levees so repaired and reconstructed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate is a bill to appropriate $12,000,000 for the emergency reconstruction of levees in the district in the area west of the Mississippi River which has just been flooded. I certainly have no objection to the bill or to the relief which is to be furnished to those districts, and which is immediately necessary. However, I think the amendment I have offered is pertinent to this legislation. It presents a unique situation, and one which, so far as I know, exists nowhere else in the United States. On the shores of Lake Erie, some 50 or 60 years ago, someone threw up a mud dike. It redeemed from what might be called a duck marsh area approximately 2,300 acres of very fine farm land. In that area there has been developed what is probably some of the finest farm land in Ohio. No one was responsible for the dike. It was originally erected by private parties. Gradually within that area there grew up, in addition to the farm, a kind of village along the shore. In that village over 200 families were living. Approximately half of those persons worked in the city of Toledo. Almost half of them had 3- or 4-acre farms on which they lived, and which they cultivated. The remaining acreage was farmed in units which averaged approximately 75 acres in size. The other half of the people who lived at that point were fishermen.

Last summer, when Lake Erie reached the highest level it has ever reached, at least for the last 20 or 25 years, there was combined with that high-water level a storm which drove the water from the east end of Lake Erie. The water broke through that dike. It flooded all the area. It has driven out of the area 250 families, who can no longer live in their homes. The water still stands there, and occasionally has been added to by subsequent floods of from 1 to 2 feet of water over the entire area. So the land now is wholly useless for farming purposes.

Last summer I took up the matter. This situation developed just after the last Mississippi River flood, in connection with which there was a relief bill to which I would have offered this amendment. At that time, I took up the matter with those in charge of the President's emergency fund, with the Chief of Army engineers, and with other Government parties. I met with very considerable approval and desire to assist; but there was no legal method by which assistance could be granted. At that time Congress had adjourned.

As I have said, we went to those in charge of the President's emergency fund. We secured from Mr. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, a letter which I will read in part. It sets out the condition and his recommendation that the money be granted from the President's emergency fund, if that could be done.

Mr. Coy, of the emergency fund, afterward felt he was not authorized to use the fund for that purpose. But I think Mr. Jones' letter is convincing. In the letter he says:

AUGUST 4, 1943.

Mr. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: An emergency condition adversely affecting several hundred families and the food-production capacity of considerable acreage along Lake Erie in the vicinity of Toledo, Ohio, has been brought to our attention by Congressman HOMER A. RAMEY and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, together with representatives of the local people affected. We understand the situation to be as follows:

An area known as Reno-Howard Farms bordering the lake some 20 miles east of Toledo was reclaimed for use and has been protected from the action of the lake for a number of years. On July 6 a combination of considerable high lake level and high wind caused the lake water to breach the dikes which protected the community within the reclaimed area. Lake water inundated the area within the dikes driving out approximately 275 families, destroying crops, and destroying or damaging farm machinery and other property. Water is now standing up to 4 feet over a considerable portion of the area. There are approximately 2,300 acres of land and 275 families affected. Practically all the families are either engaged in small market gardening or farming. The land is intensely used and highly productive. About 800 acres of the land are operated by about 240 families, the heads of which are employed mostly in Toledo. These families operate tracts of approximately 3¼ acres, growing vegetables such as tomatoes, sweet corn, beans, and carrots, and raising poultry and poultry products, each such family supplying food for about 5 additional families. The remaining acreage is farmed in units averaging about 75 acres with the main crops thereon being potatoes, corn, sugar beets, soybeans, alfalfa, wheat, oats, and barley. Exceptionally higher per acre yields are produced. Before this land can be put back into pro-

duction, it is necessary to repair the breaks in the dikes and unwater the area.

I omit a part, and then resume, as follows:

We are of the opinion that assistance in the rehabilitation of this area is well merited from the viewpoint of food production. We recognize, of course, that in rehabilitating the area there are advantages in addition to food production. Among these are health and sanitation, the reestablishment of the 275 families in their homes, and the protection of the main east and west United States highway.

In addition to these considerations, four commercial fisheries operate from the area, netting considerable tonnage of fish for nearby markets.

We recommend that, if the expenditure of Federal moneys from the President's emergency fund for assistance in works of this nature falls within an existing public policy, the necessary funds be made available to the War Department for the work necessary to rehabilitate the area. The Lucas County U. S. D. A. War Board, after considering the problems with the Ohio State War Board, has requested that consideration be given to the agricultural production in the area in reaching a decision with respect to rebuilding the dikes.

Representatives from the local area have informed us that as soon as practicable after the dikes are repaired the residents definitely intend to organize a conservancy district under provisions of Ohio statutes to insure the proper operation and maintenance of any rehabilitation works installed with Federal assistance.

Sincerely,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to make a comprehensive statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move to withdraw the bill from the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not yield for any purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. I do not yield for any purpose.

Mr. President, the objection raised to this project is that the Federal Government has never assumed responsibility for lake shores, as opposed to river shores. The distinction is made that although this is a flood, it is a lake flood and not a river flood. I am perfectly willing to admit that. As a matter of fact, the engineers have been directed to make a study of beach erosion on the lakes. It may be that 10 years from now the Federal Government will decide that lake shores of navigable lakes are just as much a Federal concern as are river shores of navigable rivers; but it has not done so, and the objection is made that if we do anything now, we shall be in some way committing the Federal Government to a general policy of looking after lake shores.

I respectfully submit that that is not the basis for this amendment. This is a war emergency measure, in order to put back into cultivation approximately 2,500 acres of good farm land, which can be done only in this way. It is peculiarly a special situation. We have appropriated Federal money for special disasters of one kind and another. We are today assuming many irrigation projects for the purpose of putting into cultivation throughout the Western States a great many small areas of land in order that more land may be brought under cultivation; and yet here are 2,500 acres of rich land which are put out of use by an act of God. It seems to me that this presents clearly a war emergency. Unless the work is done immediately, as the work desired by the Senator from Missouri on the rivers should be done, we cannot get this land into cultivation this year. It would serve a very essential and useful purpose.

It is said that this proposal would create a precedent. In order that it might not do so, I expressly inserted in the amendment the provision that it shall not create a precedent. I do not ask that it be considered as a precedent.

So far as I know, there is no other comparable situation in the United States, either on the Lakes or on the ocean. I asked Colonel Goethals, at the hearing on this bill before the Commerce Committee, the following questions:

Senator TAFT. Do you happen to know of any other situation exactly like this? That is to say, as I understand it, beach erosion is largely a question of wearing away of the land and the gradual demolition of houses and roads and so forth. Are there many occasions of this kind where land has been diked off the Lakes?

Colonel GOETHALS. No, sir. Not off the Great Lakes.

Senator TAFT. Is this about the only case that you know of?

Colonel GOETHALS. It is the only prominent case I know of without having made a complete survey.

Senator TAFT. You personally do not know of any others?

Colonel GOETHALS. I do not of my own knowledge; no.

Senator TAFT. Are there any such dikes off the ocean, protecting agriculture?

Colonel GOETHALS. In a much smaller sense, but I would say fishing property and fish houses and nets and so forth, rather than agriculture.

So far as I know, there is no other situation in which, off the ocean, or off the Lakes, there is any dike protecting an agricultural community.

There is one further ground for emergency consideration. The action of this flood has resulted in driving 275 families from their houses. The Federal Government is spending money to build emergency warehousing at a cost of about $3,000 a house. If we were considering nothing but housing, the total cost of this project would not exceed $1,000 per family residence, or per house. It is the cheapest way I know of to get war housing, if that were the only consideration in this situation. The houses are now unusable. One or two feet of water stands in all of them. They could be immediately restored to use.

I might add that the only ground of opposition of the War Department is that in some way we are departing from a general policy of the Congress that we shall not deal with lakes, but only with rivers. I do not wish to depart from that policy. But here is a special war emergency case, in which we can restore to cultivation 2,500 acres of needed land, and restore to use 275 houses which have been made unusable by an act of God and a tremendous weather condition which resulted in a flood.

A lake flood looks exactly like a river flood to anyone who sees it. The distinction is purely in the policy of the Army engineers. I respect the Army engineers. Naturally they are correct. They should adhere to the policy of Congress in spirit as well as in fact; and I do not question their opposition to this project. They say they can do the work. They have the material with which to do it, and it is perfectly easy for them to do it. They admitted in the hearings that they had the equipment on the Lakes ready to make restoration of this dike, and all they want is a declaration of policy by Congress. I wish to declare a policy for this particular case as a war emergency only. As I say, I do not think it in any way bears on the question of beach erosion. As a matter of fact, this is not beach erosion. It is a special and peculiar kind of flood which has no parallel, so far as I know, in the United States.

I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Louisiana. Following that, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not wish to ask the Senator from Ohio any questions. I reserve the right to speak on the amendment in my own time.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I wish to claim the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I feel very much embarrassed by this procedure. I asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator in charge of this very important appropriation bill, to yield to me for the purpose of asking unanimous consent that the pending measure, this very important appropriation bill, be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of taking up a bill with respect to which it did not seem to me there could be any possible opposition. It is a measure which passed the House of Representatives unanimously. It is so clearly in the interest of the national economy that it did not occur to me that there could be any possible debate, and I assured the Senator from Georgia that there would be no debate on the bill. Whereupon the Senator from Ohio offered an amendment dealing with an entirely different project, which has no possible connection with the measure for the consideration of which I ask unanimous consent. The Senator from Ohio has occupied the floor for a considerable time talking about the amendment. If the Senator from Georgia were to demand the regular order at any moment and take me from the floor, I should thank him very much for giving me the opportunity for bringing this matter up.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposal of the Senator from Ohio. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I should be prepared to vote for it. However, I assert that it is outrageous for the Senator from Ohio to barge in with such an entirely different and extraneous proposal when one and a quarter million acres of land along the Missouri and Illinois Rivers are under water at the present moment. I should much rather have the opportunity to withdraw the bill entirely, badly as we need the assistance and desperate as will be the situation unless this measure is passed, than to have the Senator from Ohio undertake to attach an entirely extraneous proposal to it.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. So far as I am concerned, if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is attached to the measure, I shall be in favor of defeating the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I have not asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio was first called to my attention as a member of the Appropriations Committee several months ago. The Senator from Ohio came before the Senate Appropriations Committee, and requested an appropriation for the purpose of reconstructing the dike on Lake Erie which had been damaged. After he had made a presentation the members of the committee very correctly stated that there was no authorization for the project, and therefore they did not think they could recommend any appropriation for it.

I then suggested to the Senator from Ohio that if he would introduce a bill, and if it should be referred to the Commerce Committee, I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Commerce Committee, would give him as prompt a hearing as possible on his bill.

The Senator from Ohio introduced a bill which, so far as I can observe from a reading of it, is practically the same as the amendment which he has now offered. He appeared before the Subcommittee on Flood Control and brought witnesses. The whole matter was gone into. Before the hearing was held the matter was submitted to the Secretary of War and to the Chief of Army Engineers for a report thereon, because, traditionally, the Senate Commerce Committee does not authorize, and Congress does not authorize, a project unless it has first received the approval of the Chief of Engineers, and has been transmitted to the Congress under such a report by the Secretary of War.

The Chief of Army Engineers reported adversely upon the project. The subcommittee listened to the testimony and came to the conclusion that the bill should not be favorably reported, and so reported to the full committee. No favorable action was taken by the full committee upon the bill.

The Senator from Ohio now offers an amendment which, if favorably acted upon, would be contrary to the precedents of the Congress. He has offered an amendment which has been repudiated by the Chief of Engineers and by the Commerce Committee of the Senate. He is now trying to tack it on to this bill without any further consideration of it on the floor of the Senate. He is trying to tack it onto a very important and urgent bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I respectfully suggest to my colleagues that the amendment be voted down.

Within a few days my committee will take up the omnibus flood-control bill, and I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Ohio appear again with his amendment. It will be reconsidered. I am quite sure, however, that he will not get anywhere with it unless the Army engineers make a favorable report upon it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, obviously the Chief of Engineers will not make a favorable report upon the amendment, because it is not the policy of Congress to have the engineers do anything on lakes but only on rivers.

Mr. President, I should like to deal with the suggestion that it is something outrageous for me to submit an amendment to this bill. The Senator's bill is to get water off approximately 150,000 acres. How many acres are involved?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. About a million and a half acres of the most valuable land in the world.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's bill deals with floods where homes are under water, and where it is desired to rebuild the dikes and put the land back into condition to be used for farming. My bill has exactly the same purpose. The flood water from a lake looks like flood water from a river. Two hundred acres of Ohio farm land is just as good as 200 acres of Missouri farm land. The subject matter is exactly the same as that which the Senator is dealing with in his bill. It is germane to the issue. Of course, I am appealing from the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce to the Senate because from the beginning the Senator from Louisiana was opposed to the project. I have stated my position and he has stated his, and that is the question which I wish to submit to the Senate and have the Senate decide.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is in error. I was not opposed to the project from the beginning. I made up my mind to oppose it after I had listened to engineers, and had heard the evidence submitted before the subcommittee.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but the only opposition to the bill is on the ground that the Federal Government has assumed no responsibility for lake shores, and will assume responsibility only for river shores. That is the only reason for the opposition. I am perfectly willing to say that, as a general policy, the Federal Government should not for the present take over lake shores, although I think it will do so in the course of the next 10 years after the report on erosion has been presented.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. This is not a project relating to rivers and harbors, whether they be in the coastal areas along our seaboards or on the Great Lakes. It is not submitted to the Army engineers for a report thereon.

Mr. TAFT. The Army engineers, however, did not turn this proposal down as being economically unjustified. They turned it down only on the ground of policy, and I think the Congress can properly overrule that decision. The Army engineers took the position which they took only because Congress had said that they are not liable for such matters affecting lakes, and therefore they would not assume responsibility. I might say that if this project had been an irrigation project, or if the Irrigation Bureau had been involved, the engineers would have recommended the project in a hurry. But the Army engineers are properly considerate of the policy laid down for them to follow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say one thing more, if I may, to the Senator from Georgia.

Before I offered the amendment, and before the Senator from Missouri made his last motion, I had told him that I intended to offer the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I showed him the amendment. I did not do so before his previous statement, but I did not bring the amendment in as a surprise.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will excuse me, I shall have to insist on the regular order.

Mr. TAFT. I think we are about through. I shall not take more than 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has told me that he wishes to address himself to this question.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I believe that if the amendment is adopted it will establish a very serious precedent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized in my own right in order merely to express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for his willingness to lay aside the very important appropriation bill, and permit this emergency matter to be taken up. Certainly not the Senator from Georgia, but the Senator from Ohio, is the one who has injected entirely extraneous matter into the present situation, and I wish to express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for his kindness in allowing my bill to be taken up.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 67, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$420,000."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on page 67, line 19, it is proposed to increase the item of $100,000 to $420,000 for Federal crop insurance liquidation, as I understand. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator please explain why it was necessary to increase the original amount to the extent recommended?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Budget estimates submitted to the House of Representatives carried in excess of $5,000,000 for continuation of the Federal crop-insurance program. The House of Representatives rejected the idea of continuing the crop-insurance program, and the Senate committee very reluctantly concurred in that action. However, in the Senate Appropriations Committee it was demonstrated beyond any peradventure that the House in applying the rule of thumb as to the amount necessary in the liquidation of the program had selected entirely too low a figure. There are approximately 300,000 crop-insurance policies already outstanding. The Senator is aware of the fact that some of them were for a 3-year period, and those policies will run through the fiscal year 1945. The Senate, therefore, allowed a sufficient sum to service those policies, but to liquidate the Crop Insurance Corporation in an orderly manner.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment reported by the committee on page 67, line 19, is agreed to.

The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service", on page 69, line 16, after the word "equipment", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further,* That in any case in which a State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil-conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil-conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land", on page 71, after line 15, to insert:

EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

To enable the Secretary to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32 in a sum not exceeding $50,000,000: *Provided,* That such funds shall be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1945 without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly tell me what happened to the authorization bill relating to agricultural and certain other matters?

Mr. RUSSELL. The authorization bill has been agreed to in conference, but the House has not yet taken up the conference report. The conference committee agreed on all except one amendment which is in disagreement, a minor amendment, and the Senate is waiting for the House to act. They requested the conference, and the House conferees will therefore be compelled to report to the House before the report can be considered by the Senate. I understand the debate on the so-called G. I. bill has precluded the opportunity.

Mr. TAFT. What was the agreement of the conference committee as to the Farm Security Administration and the school lunch program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The agreement of the conference committee was to limit the Farm Security Administration to 1 year instead of 2 years as proposed by the Senate and to limit the school lunch program to 2 years as provided in the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marketing Service," on page 73, line 11, after the word "products", to strike out "$1,267,290" and insert "$1,271,290."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, after line 15, to insert:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws, (2) loans to needy individual farmers, (3) grants, and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $28,265,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $57,000 for compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided,* That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under his supervision, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $96,710,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at not to exceed the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agricultural commodities.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corpora-

tions only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1945 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia for an explanation of the provision at the bottom of page 78, line 23, which reads:

(4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects.

Can the Senator tell us what is being done and what progress has been made in the liquidation program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can give the Senator a general idea. Considerable progress has been made. Several thousand individual farm units have been disposed of. I cannot advise the Senator as to the exact degree of liquidation, but I can assure him that very definite progress has been made in liquidating the cooperating farm projects.

A very lengthy table which appears in the House report on page 982, shows that 5,422 units of these farms have been completely liquidated out of a total of 9,029.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Leaving about 4,000 unliquidated.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct, that is farming units within the project. The liquidation has occurred, I may say, within the past year. It is accumulative, but Mr. Hancock, the present Administrator, is expediting the liquidation of these projects to a very great extent. 5,700 out of 9,029, or over 50 percent of them, have been sold and I feel that they are being liquidated as expeditiously as is consistent with sound business practice. Of course, we do not want the Government to sacrifice these lands by throwing them on the market.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is the pay roll under that liquidation program decreasing to any extent?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot give the Senator the figures on that specific item in the Farm Security Administration, but I am sure the Senator will be delighted to hear that the total number of employees of the Farm Security Administration has been reduced from more than 19,000 in 1943, to 9,000 for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am happy to hear that. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. On page 79, in the same section, beginning on line 16, I read the following:

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources.

Will the Senator explain what is intended by that provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do so. A number of years ago it occurred to me that it was an erroneous policy to give absolute outright grants to the people who were the beneficiaries of the farm-security program unless such grants were awarded in the case of flood or drought or some other extraordinary occurrence that destroyed their crops and impaired their means of earning a livelihood. I, therefore, wrote this provision in the bill to attempt to have the Secretary of Agriculture force all recipients of these grants to do some work somewhere before they received the grants. That is the purpose of that language.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Has that practice been in force for some time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I first offered it, as I recall, to the appropriation bill 4 years ago. It has been in the bill for 4 years. I am frank to say it has not produced all the results I hope for, but it has at least in a great many instances required men to clean out fence corners or to rebuild terraces or do something else, so that in some degree they would be earning this money, rather than receive an outright grant.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does that mean that the practice of the administration in this set-up requires every individual who gets a grant to do some kind of work?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it does not. It does not in disaster cases. I might say to the Senator I would have no objection to striking out the language if he has objection to it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no objection, but I want to find out what it is about.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are only $250,000 in the bill for grants, and the grants are to be reserved and restricted to disaster cases, so there will not be any outright grants next year. I think the Senator will agree with me that when we were making these huge grants it is better that the recipients perform some work.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I only want to make sure that something is paid for the work of the individuals who are permitted to receive grants.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not agree with the Senator's views as to that. I think they ought to do some work for all these grants. But that is not involved here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee beginning on page 78, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, are the appropriations made here for all these rehabilitation agencies including the R. A. C. C.?

Mr. RUSSELL. The appropriations are only to liquidate the rehabilitation agencies.

Mr. WHERRY. The R. A. C. C. is under the Farm Security.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is under the Farm Security.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not involved in this amendment at all.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farm tenancy," on page 83, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 8, before the word "which", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 9, to insert:

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590x–5), including the exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, $1,025,000, of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration," on apge 85, line 8, after the word "reports", to strike out "$2,550,000" and insert "$2,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate now considering the amendment on page 85?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the amendment on page 85, line 8.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I desire to ask a question about the next amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to go back to page 83 and have the Senator explain why there is an increase of the appropriation to $20,000,000 for the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The authorization for that item is $50,000,000, and that amount has been carried for a number of years. Last year we reduced it to $30,000,000. We did so because we did not feel that the Government should be engaged in buying a great deal of land at a time when we were trying to prevent inflationary prices of farm land. This year only $15,000,000 was allowed as compared with $50,000,000 for a number of years. We felt that it was really a little low so we added $5,000,000.

I might say the Government is not losing money on the land loans; there has not been any money lost on them at all, but there has been on some of the rehabilitation loans. It is a sound investment idea for the tenant farmer and

the sharecroppers to have these loans. It is a step in the right direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 14, after "(U. S. C. 901–914)", to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000", which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment on page 85, line 14. My recollection is that in the Committee on Agriculture, when we discussed this matter, everyone agreed, including those who were interested in the Rural Electrification Administration, that $35,000,000 was the amount satisfactory to everyone. I see that the committee has changed the appropriation to $40,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not aware of any such understanding. When the legislative provision, House bill 4278, was before the committee, it was very apparent that the House had removed any limitation on the amount which should be made available for loans under the Rural Electrification Administration, other than the amount Congress might decide to appropriate. When the bill was pending on the floor, the fact was brought out in colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself, that there was no limitation on the amount to be available for making loans beyond what Congress saw fit to fix.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. We conducted hearings on this important activity. The officials of the R. E. A. appeared before the committee and suggested that a sum of $60,000,000 should be made available for loans. After investigating the matter, the committee decided that probably not more than $45,000,000 would be required, due to the scarcity of strategic materials which go into the R. E. A. projects. We reduced the fund by $5,000,000, and made $40,000,000 available.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There were a number of letters in my desk from the Rural Electrification project people before we had the meeting in the Committee of Agriculture some time ago, all of them asking for a $35,000,000 limit, and I went away from the committee meeting with the feeling in my mind that everyone was tentatively agreed on that amount. So I was startled when I saw this increase of $5,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I must absolve myself from the Senator having the feeling that $35,000,000 would be the maximum required, because I have in times past championed amendments on the floor of the Senate providing $100,000,000 for the R. E. A. loans, and that sum has been approved in the past. But the Senator need not be apprehensive that the Government will lose any money out of these loans. The rural electrification cooperatives have, with 2 or 3 exceptions, out of more than 900 in the country, anticipated the muturities of their loans. I do not think the Government will lose any money on the loans.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, recurring to the amendment on page 84, appropriating $1,025,000 to carry into effect the provisions of an act to promote conservation in the arid areas of the United States, and so forth, will the Senator tell me what the projects are and what that money is to be used for?

Mr. RUSSELL. The particular project is what is known as the little dams project, which has been in effect for a number of years. I think last year it was combined in the activities of the Farm Security Administration.

Last year the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has been the patron saint of this activity for some 8 or 10 years, decided that he would attempt to have it divorced from the Farm Security Administration, inasmuch as that Administration's life seemed to be somewhat uncertain. So he offered an amendment to make it a separate project, and that was done.

When the bill came to the Senate this year this provision was not in it. It had been eliminated by the House, along with the item for the Farm Security Administration. It does not involve any new activity or any new expenditure. It is merely set up in a different fashion in the bill, taken out of the Farm Security Administration, and the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration was reduced by the amount of this item.

Mr. TAFT. Is it for construction of dams for irrigation purposes?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; not for irrigation. It has to do with obtaining sources of water for stock in the arid and semi-arid areas. The Government supplies engineering advice. The engineers go out and blueprint the projects for the farmers, and in some cases farmers in years past, when there were grants for the Farm Security Administration, worked on the projects. I do not think the Administration ever spent the full amount appropriated, but Senators from the arid and semi-arid areas, including the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], are more familiar with the details of the activity than I am, and they all say this is a very important and helpful service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 85, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have some floor amendments I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 23, after the name "Columbia" it is proposed to insert "including the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this has to do with compensation received by Dr. Tolley, who is the director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I regret that it has been necessary to bring this amendment to the floor of the Senate for the past 4 years. That has been because of the fact that no legislation has been enacted to arrange for this and other unusual cases in the Department.

For a number of years Dr. Tolley was the head of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and received a salary of $10,000 a year. Under the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, which was affected some 4 years ago, the activities and functions of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics were tremendously increased, and Dr. Tolley was transferred to that agency. This amendment has been offered on the floor for the past 3 years merely to preserve his present status. It does not involve any increase in his salary. It is necessary because of the fact that when the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture took place there was no statute fixing the salary of the head of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 11, after the word "Administrator," it is proposed to insert the words "including the salary of the Administrator at $9,200 a year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, line 12, after the words "Chief Forester," it is proposed to insert "at $9,200 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 59, line 12, after the figure "$200,000," it is proposed to insert the words "upon authorization or approval of the War Food Administrator, travel expenses to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations not to exceed $20,000, including travel in privately owned automobiles, of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 63, line 6, after the figure, it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "together with not to exceed $40,000,000 of the funds appropriated under section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; in all, not to exceed $290,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that concludes the administrative amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

POST-WAR PLANNING FOR FORESTRY

For the preparation, either independently or under cooperative arrangements, of detailed project plans for post-war public works, including, but not limited to, such activities as reforestation and revegetation, facilities for wood-waste utilization, construction of improvements, timber-stand improvement, and the control of rodents and forest-tree insects and diseases, on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and on State, county, municipal, and private forest lands, $5,593,830. This appropriation shall be available for all necessary expenses, including personal service in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would not now bring this matter before the Senate and in this way if I did not from the bottom of my heart believe in the necessity for obtaining the appropriation at this time.

During the past several months we have heard much talk about, and have made some appropriations for, global planning for the post-war period. Within reasonable limits that is fine. But we also need a little planning of that type for our own United States. That is what this proposal calls for.

None of us knows just what the situation will be after the war. Tro probability is that during the demobilization period private industry will not be able to absorb immediately all our veterans and war workers. It will then be necessary, therefore, for the Federal Government to undertake a rather extensive public-works program to relieve unemployment. In preparation for such an eventuality, it is my belief, and that of other members of the committee, that provisions should be made by the Congress for financing a minimum amount of advance planning.

During the hearings, the committee brought out that wartime demands have put a severe drain upon our forest and range resources, vast areas of which, even before the war, were in bad shape. The importance of these resources amply justifies the expenditure of a comparatively small sum, now, for the preparation of advance plans to rehabilitate them. The hearings also brought out that in the great unemployment period of a few years ago the Forest Service—the agency which Congress created to look out for our forest resources—did a magnificent job in cooperation with the States in providing highly useful work on our forest lands for thousands of C. C. C. boys and others badly in need of work. More than a million man-years of useful employment were thus provided during that period.

Consequently, the committee requested the Forest Service to prepare estimates covering the cost of planning the many additional worth-while public works which still need to be constructed on forest lands. These estimates were submitted to the committee by the Forest Service, and are to be found in considerable detail in the record of our hearings beginning on page 195 and continuing on page 537.

The Nation's goal should be to build up and maintain high productivity on a permanent basis. To that end it is important that our forest and range resources be restored as promptly as possible during the years following the war. We should therefore be prepared to undertake, without delay, constructive measures for reforestation, for better utilization of waste materials, for the protection of the watersheds of our navigable rivers, for adequate fire protection of the existing forests, for developing better ranges for livestock, for protecting our wildlife, and for otherwise obtaining better returns from the forest lands which constitute one-third of the area of this country.

Mr. President, I want Senators who are kind enough to be present and listen to what I am saying, to understand that one-third of the entire area of the United States is forest area. It is the one natural resource which should be protected for the future, for posterity, and for the boys we love to talk about and for whom we do so little. The time to begin planning and preparing the blueprints is not after the boys are disembarking in New York, or some city in Georgia or on the west coast. The time to be making plans is now.

The Forest Service is well equipped to administer and guide the post-war reconstruction and conservation of our forest lands. In the period following 1933, the Forest Service in cooperation with the States—as mentioned a moment ago—was able to employ large numbers of persons in constructive work on these lands. If the need arises, it can again undertake a greatly expanded program which will be of tremendous value and will at the same time provide extensive employment opportunities. However, as clearly developed during the hearings, the experience of the Forest Service and other agencies in carrying out the earlier public-works programs demonstrated the fact that a much better job could have been done with more careful and adequate advance planning.

In connection with all the good work which was done by the C. C. C. boys there was great waste of public moneys, because no previous planning had been done. The boys were sent to the forests of the West and the South and all over the country, and they had to be put to work immediately. Due to the fact that no previous planning had been done, quite a large amount of money was wasted.

For example, as Chief Forester Watts testified, serious losses took place in forest plantations during the earlier stages of the C. C. C. program because the boys had to be put to work before adequate soil surveys and other needed advance planning steps could be taken. This difficulty was overcome later, but if plans had been prepared well in advance, the expenditures subsequently involved in this and in other projects would have yielded much greater and more lasting benefits in the public interest. The lack of such plans not only resulted in a diminution of the public benefits, but the confusion arising out of the necessity for proceeding without adequate work plans also impaired materially the opportunity for providing maximum employment in the areas, and at the times most needed.

While the Forest Service no doubt plans as carefully as possible the programs financed from regular appropriations, the detailed planning of a greatly expanded work program obviously requires additional funds in advance of the anticipated need for furnishing employment.

That is the idea of the proposal contained in the amendment—plan now and be ready. All of this clearly shows that in view of general developments in the war situation, steps should be taken, now, to finance the preparation of detailed project plans for a post-war program on forest and range lands. As mentioned previously, the Forest Service, at the request of the committee, has prepared estimates to cover the preparation of such plans. I want Senators to follow me, because these figures and facts were obtained from persons who know. These estimates include the preparation of project plans for such activities as reforestation of denuded lands which are chiefly valuable for the production of timber. Present estimates indicate that there are 77,000,000 acres of forest land in this country so badly denuded that planting of trees on the major portion of the area must be undertaken if the lands are to be made fully productive. That area is greater than the combined areas of all the New England States, plus New York and Delaware. That is an enormous area of waste land.

Think of it Senators, 77,000,000 acres of badly denuded land. Is the Senate of the United States interested in that great problem? Will the boys who are coming back after having served in the armed forces be interested in that great problem? I think they will be interested in it, and I believe the Senate should also be interested in it.

Another activity is construction of improvements for fire control. More than 30,000,000 acres are still burned over annually due to lack of adequate fire control improvements and other fire-protection needs.

Think of it, Senators, 30,000,000 acres of our lands are burned over annually. Have we, as Senators, any responsibility in that connection? Have we any responsibility to the boys who are doing the

fighting to take some action now in order to save 30,000,000 acres from being burned yearly?

The estimates also include preparation of project plans for the following:

Greater utilization of the some 65 percent of the forest growth which should be utilized but is now wasted. Only one-third of the forest growth that should be used now comes out as seasoned lumber.

Revegetation of range lands. As denuded forest lands need to be replanted to trees, so also is it necessary for denuded range lands to be reseeded. Thousands of acres of such lands need revegetation.

Mr. President, I could continue with dozens of other examples of work that needs to be done, and should be done, on our forest and range lands. All point clearly to the common-sense conclusion, which should appeal to the average Senator, that preparatory to undertaking such work advance planning is absolutely necessary if the work funds which will later be made available are to be expended economically and wisely. Are we going to have funds available later to take care of unemployment, to take care of the boys who are coming back from the war? You know we are, Mr. President. So, why not be intelligent now and be ready with a sound policy of protecting what belongs to all of us—the forests of the United States?

Authority to undertake planning is included in the organic acts under which the national forests were established and are operated, Sixteenth United States Code, pages 471 and 476; in the McSweeney-McNary Act, Sixteenth United States Code, page 581; in the Clarke-McNary Act, Sixteenth United States Code, page 564; and in the Norris-Doxey Act, Sixteenth United States Code, page 568–b. They provide for cooperation with the States in forest conservation and in other authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture.

I believe that most of the members of the committee join me in hoping that the Senate will approve this amendment, which will have a very important influence for us on future forest and range conservation in this country.

Mr. President, I have never been more sincere in submitting an amendment or in working for an appropriation than I am in the present instance. It is my studied opinion that out of the millions of dollars we have appropriated or will appropriate this afternoon, not one penny is more worthy of consideration than the amount called for in the amendment now before the Senate. The forests of the Nation are the greatest resource of the people of the United States.

I know that to have the Senate suspend the rule, in order to attach legislation to an appropriation bill, is contrary to the general method of procedure; but we are living in a different era. We should be thinking of the days that lie ahead, and should be ready to take care of the situation which will confront us then. I sincerely hope that the Members of the Senate who have been so kind as to listen to my remarks will approve of this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a summary of estimates for detailed project plans for a post-war forest and range conservation program.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREST SERVICE—SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES FOR DETAILED PROJECT PLANS FOR A POST-WAR FOREST AND RANGE CONSERVATION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1945—PLANNING COST ESTIMATE

Hazard reduction and fire prevention: Planning includes reconnaissance on national forests, subsequent selection of areas to be treated and measures to be taken; preparation of instructions for work on specific projects; for prevention, includes drafting working drawings and specifications for exhibit fabrication (Budget project No. 3, fire control, etc.), $252,800.

Control of tree-destroying insects, diseases, and rodents: Planning consists of field surveys to determine location, nature, and extent of infested areas, and preparation of instructions for treating specific areas (Budget project No. 4), $60,000.

Timber stand improvement and general timber surveys: Item includes stand improvement thinning, pruning, and removal of undesirable species; surveys of timber growth and volume. Planning consists of establishing priorities and standards, selecting areas to be worked on, and preparing instructions for treatment by individual project areas (Budget project No. 5, timber use), $482,000.

Range reseeding, general surveys, and eradication of poisonous plants: Activity consists of reseeding national forest range lands, general surveys to secure data on forage and stock conditions, and eradication of poisonous plants. Planning includes reconnaissance to determine work volume and priority of action; developing standards of accomplishment and preparing instructions for treating individual project areas (Budget project No. 6, grazing use), $160,300.

Developing food and cover for wildlife, and general wildlife surveys: Planning consists of reconnaissance to determine critical areas; establish priorities and standards; outline measures to be taken and prepare instructions for treating individual project areas (Budget project No. 7, "Wildlife management"), $81,500.

Acquisition of land for national forests, mapping, etc.: Planning for acquisition consists of determining specific areas where Federal interest is paramount, and developing courses of action for prompt expansion or initiation of an actual purchase program; for mapping, consists of ascertaining areas for which aerial photographs and maps are required for protection and resource management and developing project plans for conducting a work program (Budget project No. 9, "Land-use management, etc."), $303,200.

Construction and betterment of improvements: Planning consists of surveying sites or routes, designing and preparing detailed engineering plans, specifications and material lists for all classes and types of national forest roads, structures, water-supply installations, etc.; in other words, making the blueprints for each improvement.

Improvements must be considered integrally with the cultural activity they serve even though appearing as a separate item for planning estimates. Roads and crew quarters are of course essential to protection, particularly in the extensive undeveloped areas of western regions. The access road, moreover, is often the first step in a stand improvement or planting project; buildings to house men, supplies, and equipment are frequently necessary before a nursery or plantation can be established.

Fences and water are the important physical controls in range management; fences and water developments are improvements, so these erosion-control measures and other range improvements are as necessary to better range practice as reseeding and other cultural treatments.

Improvements are likewise just the structural phase of all other forest land development measures such as providing wildlife food, picnicking grounds, and water-conserving devices.

It is extremely important, therefore, for detail planning for improvements to be conducted concurrently with that for the cultural aspects of resource protection and management of activities (budget project No. 11, construction of improvements, etc.), $3,449,830.

Reforestation: Planning includes reconnaissance and selection of nursery and plantation sites, preparing detailed plans and instructions for production or procurement of planting stock, site preparation and planting (budget project No. 12, reforestation), $304,000.

Total, national forests, $5,093,830.

On State, county, municipal, and private lands: Planning includes preparation of project plans for fire-control improvements, fire-hazard reduction, and reforestation (appropriations: forest-fire cooperation and farm and other private forestry cooperation), $500,000.

Grand total, Forest Service, $5,593,830.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, reverting to the pending amendment, first I wish to say to my very dear friend the Senator from New Mexico that I think he has made an exceedingly able presentation on behalf of the importance of and necessity for post-war planning in respect to forestry. However, I happen to be a member of a special Senate committee which is dealing with post-war planning as a concrete whole—the entire conception—and it seems to me that it is desperately important that there be some central clearing house dealing with post-war planning projects, because otherwise the prospectus will become simply infinite, and utterly without limitation, without correlation, and without coordination.

The special Senate committee which was created for the purpose of setting up a central clearing house in respect to post-war planning has been constantly at work for many months. It is dealing with problems in the order of their priority of pressure, with respect to the time when the post-war problem must be actually confronted.

The question of public works in their various phases has not yet been fully canvassed. We have had some testimony on the phase of public-works planning, related, for example, to public roads. We have had testimony in other aspects of post-war public-works planning, but we are not as yet ready to make a general recommendation on the subject.

I have the feeling, with great respect for the argument made by the Senator from New Mexico, that it would be a very unfortunate thing if we were to start by piecemeal legislation to deal with the subject of post-war planning in the field of public works, because the

whole purpose of the Senate in creating this clearing house and in initiating the effort which the so-called George committee is making, has been to minimize public works as much as possible as a reliance in the post-war period, so that the major reliance can be placed upon private enterprise to provide normal jobs in normal private enterprise on regular pay rolls. We accept the conception that there will be an interim need for public works; but, Mr. President, we reject the premise that public works should be the primary reliance of the United States in respect to post-war planning. Therefore we have undertaken the constructive effort to release private enterprise to the creation of post-war employment first. That does not rule out the necessity for creating a reservoir of essential public works, to take up any lag or sag in the interim before private enterprise can again get in motion.

However, I respectfully submit to my able friend from New Mexico that the public-works problem in respect to post-war planning should be taken up as a whole, and canvassed as a whole. Its segments should be allocated in respect to appropriations with a view to the over-all picture, and we should not proceed piecemeal to deal with it now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not disagree with the Senator from Michigan that, if at all possible, private enterprise should take care of unemployment. I agree with him completely. But I insist that, whether we call it piecemeal or not, the responsibility of the Congress of the United States in taking care of a third of the area of the United States is our responsibility, and it is just as important as the idea of having private enterprise take care of unemployment, because it affects all the people.

I grant that private enterprise should be given the opportunity to take care of unemployment if it can do so in all instances; but private enterprise will take care of only a few, even from the unemployment standpoint. I am not approaching the question of taking care of forest planting now, or work in the forest reserves, from the standpoint of unemployment alone. That is only incidental to the large responsibility of taking care of public property. I do not believe that the program which I have outlined would in any way interfere with the larger program. Using diligence in getting to work through the appropriation of a small amount of money in a matter which affects every individual in the country would not interfere with the larger program. The third of the area of the United States about which I am speaking belongs to all the people of the United States, and I think we have quite a responsibility in connection with it. If we accept that responsibility now, we in no way interfere with the idea which the Senator from Michigan has in mind, and to which I agree.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think there is no disagreement between us regarding the ultimate problem. I referred to the primary emphasis which the George committee has placed upon private enterprise with respect to post-war planning merely to indicate why we have not as yet reached a conclusive program in respect to public works. We have taken the problems in the order—in our view—recommended by the importance of the various factors. What I am now saying is that when we reach the point where there is post-war planning for public works, it should be approached with an over-all view in respect to all phases of public works which are related to post-war planning.

I concede that everything the Senator says about the importance of forestry in respect to post-war planning is true. I simply suggest that there are other equally important factors in post-war public works planning which should be part of the decision which the Senate makes in respect to post-war public works planning.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that his own amendment says:

> For the preparation, either independently or under cooperative arrangements, of detailed project plans for post-war public works, including, but not limited to * * * reforestation—

And so forth. In other words, my able friend is presenting an amendment which on its face presumes to cover the entire post-war public works planning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator from Michigan misunderstands the meaning of the words "but not limited to" in the amendment. They refer to activities such as reforestation and revegetation. There might be some other classes of work to be done within the forest areas. The amendment has nothing to do with the construction of a building which the Government might need in New York, Denver, Albuquerque, or Detroit. It has nothing to do with schools. It has to do only with matters which come within the scope of the Forest Service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not wish to persist in any controversy with my friend from New Mexico regarding the importance of post-war planning for forestry. I agree with everything he has said with respect to its importance, and I am prepared to join with him in the proper forum at the appropriate time when post-war planning can be decided fundamentally and basically by the Senate. The Senate has a special committee which was created to function in that precise behalf.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement; but, once in awhile, I became a little impatient—and I know that the Senator will pardon me for saying so—about proposals which are awaiting the appropriate time. Many sins have been committed by waiting for the appropriate time to do something. How many times have we neglected to do our duty by waiting for the appropriate time? I think the time is now. Why lock the barn after the horse has been taken away? The time to lock it is when the horse is inside. The time to get ready for the future is now. In my opinion, respectfully submitted with the Senator's permission, the time to take care of public property is now.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator's conscience is entirely clear with respect to the amendment which he submitted, and I again say to him that I have no quarrel with him over the importance which he attaches to post-war planning for forestry. Forestry is one of perhaps 20 major divisions of post-war planning, the sum total of which the Senate had better take into account before it starts to make any special allocations of funds without knowing what the sum total is. After all, there is a limit to the resources of the American people which the Senate can commit to post-war planning, at home, abroad, or anywhere else. We had better have a conception of our total obligations before we start to build up that obligation without the essential knowledge regarding the over-all problem.

So, Mr. President, I am reluctantly forced to make the point of order against the amendment so that at least a two-thirds vote shall be required in order to pass it at this time. Then I shall join the Senator from New Mexico in the proper forum in order to achieve the results for which he has asked.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator. I think we have made progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 53, in line 10, was agreed to, be reconsidered, so that I may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered. The committee amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on page 53, line 10, I move that the amount of $298,475 be increased to $323,475, which is an increase of $25,000 over the amount determined upon when the committee amendment was first agreed to.

I appeared before the subcommittee and made quite a lengthy statement on a very important problem which confronts Utah, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, and several other Western States. The problem has been caused by an overcrowding of our forest ranges, as well as the public ranges of the States to which I have referred, by an overpopulation of big game, principaly deer and elk. Something must be done to relieve the overpopulation. While I was in Utah in April I was consulted by a group of livestock men, a delegation of sportsmen, State officials, and grazing service officials, telling me of the importance of the problem and the fact that it was becoming progressively worse.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Utah appeared before the committee and presented this matter most earnestly. The committee was impressed with the importance of the subject matter, but concluded that if the work which

the Senator has requested were to be done it should be done within the Department of the Interior by the wildlife agency. The Senator from Utah discussed the matter with me today on the floor and told me that he had looked into the matter, that the wildlife agency did not have the facilities for doing the work, and that the Forest Service had already done some work along this line.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. If my colleagues on the committee do not object, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to the committee amendment on page 53, line 10.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 11, after the words "same extent as other producers", it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further,* That the War Food Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 agricultural conservation program with respect to any farm if the War Food Administration determines that the producer would have been eligible for such payments except for the failure of such producer, because of negligence of an officer or agent of the Federal Government, to file on or before June 30, 1943, Form ACP–140, and such payments shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774)."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am directed by the committee to offer this as a committee amendment. The amendment explains itself, unless Senators desire further information with reference to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, how much money is involved?

Mr. OVERTON. About $5,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4443) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

SHORTAGE OF FARM TOOLS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I voted against the extension of lend-lease. One of the reasons why I voted against it was that some months after lend-lease went into operation, I visited Portal, N. Dak., a port of entry into Canada from the United States. There I saw rubber-tired threshing machines, splendid up-to-date combines, and other fine farm machinery which is so badly needed by the farmers of the Northwest. They were about to be exported to Canada. Upon my return, I made an investigation. I have watched the situation, and have found that the exportation of farm machinery, farm tools, and farm-machinery repair parts to foreign countries has continued steadily since then.

I ask the Senate why farmers in Ethiopia, or in Latvia, or in any other foreign country should receive machinery which American farmers need so badly at the present time.

Two weeks ago today, Mr. President, I was in one of the large farm-machinery houses in Fargo, N. Dak. It is owned by Kelley Brothers. Scores of farmers were there, begging for farm machinery. But they were unable to obtain a single piece. Mr. John Kelley, the president of the firm, advised me that not only did he not have on hand any farm machinery of any kind, character, or description, but that he did not even have any repair parts, except for a few obsolete pieces, and that he did not have any second-hand machinery. He stated: "I have gone as far south and west as Oklahoma in an endeavor to get some machinery for the farmers of the Northwest, but it has been practically impossible."

To make matters worse, Mr. President, those in control in Washington announce they will continue these exports, not only during the war but after the war. These exports of farm machinery so badly needed by the farmers have been made under lend-lease. The farmers are paying taxes to send farm machinery to other countries, where after the war the machinery will be used by farmers who will be in competition with our own farmers. In my opinion, lend-lease was never intended for any such purpose. The farmers of America are perfectly willing, in my opinion, to have this country under lend-lease send to our allies munitions and articles to be used under purposes of war, because they know that in the majority of cases our allies are getting it. But our farmers certainly never contemplated that they would be taxed to supply foreign lands with binders and combines, drills and harrows, tractors and disks, and other farm machinery and farm tools so badly needed in this country, together with the rubber tires to equip them, while they went without.

In addition to my vote against lend-lease, at this time I wish to protest against the economic destruction of our farmers under the guise of lend-lease. In substantiation of my vote against lend-lease, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Scandal Seen in Shortage of Farm Tools," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald for Monday, May 15.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCANDAL SEEN IN SHORTAGE OF FARM TOOLS—W. P. B. "COVER UP" HIT AS POLITICAL MOVE

(By Philip Warden)

A farm-machinery shortage so serious that War Food Administrator Marvin Jones has refused to bring it out into the open for fear of the consequences to President Roosevelt's fourth-term ambitions was threatening yesterday to become one of the major scandals of the war.

Blamed for this farm-tool shortage that farm men say actually threatens international disaster on the food front" are farm machinery officials of the War Production Board who allegedly falsified production figures and the "big eight" of the farm-machinery manufacturers.

PROTEST DELAY OF PROBE

So serious is the situation that War Production Chief Donald Nelson is taking time off from his job of keeping war factories going to take a special trip to Detroit the first week in June with leaders of the national farm organizations to make a personal investigation. To the farm leaders' delay of the investigation until June is said to be dangerously long, probably too late.

MISS GOAL ON PLANTERS

As agricultural men viewed the situation, approximately 20 to 50 percent fewer farm tools have been produced than W. P. B. and W. F. A. assured the farmers would be produced during the winter for their use this year.

TRACTORS, COMBINES HIT QUOTAS

Only the production of tractors, 2 percent ahead of the announced goal, and large combines have been produced in anything like the promised quantities, which are far below actual requirements, the farm men said.

Leaders of the national farm organizations, suspecting that the New Deal agencies were hiding something in their farm-machinery production figures, Thursday sent Edward J. O'Neal, American Farm Bureau Federation president, to call on his friend, Administrator Jones, to "get the low down."

DISHING OUT GLAMORIZED REPORTS

According to the Washington Farm Reporter, a publication of the National Grange written by Agricultural Service Associates, a group of writers that work closely with leaders of all the major farm organizations, this is what took place:

"Could it be that the Farm Machinery Division of W. P. B. wasn't going to fulfill its program?" O'Neal demanded of Jones. "Could it be that it was dishing out glamorized reports?"

It not only could be, but was, said Jones. He called in one of his specialists to prove it. Saying that he would do everything in his power to "needle" W. P. B. into action, Jones flatly refused O'Neal's demands that he do something about it immediately.

He let it be known that the White House had strictly forbidden any interagency squabbles between now and November 7, and that it wasn't going to be the one to disobey White House orders.

O'Neal, according to the Farm Reporter, came away from W. F. A. boiling. He called an immediate conference of the other farm-organization leaders.

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 17, 1944

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Office of the Secretary

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, and other personal services in the Office of the Secretary in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of one and the maintenance, repair, and operation of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, $1,700,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $187,390, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal

1 year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts
2 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
3 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
4 appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
5 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
6 thereon with representatives of the Department of Agricul-
7 ture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department,
8 shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as
9 changed by such reductions or increases in such appro-
10 priations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the
11 Secretary is authorized to contract for stenographic re-
12 porting services, and the appropriations made in this Act
13 shall be available for such purposes, and to expend from
14 appropriations available for the purchase of lands not to
15 exceed $1 for each option to purchase any particular
16 tract or tracts of land: *Provided further,* That with the
17 approval of the Secretary, employees of the Department
18 stationed abroad may enter into leases for official quar-
19 ters, for periods not exceeding one year, and may pay
20 rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other
21 charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the dis-
22 charge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country
23 where custom or practice requires payment in advance:
24 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by
25 this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or

1 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
2 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division,
3 commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
4 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to dam-
5 age threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to
6 future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided fur-*
7 *ther,* That, except to provide materials required in or incident
8 to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic
9 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by
10 this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manu-
11 factured from commodities or materials produced outside of
12 the United States.

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor includ-
15 ing personal services in the District of Columbia and else-
16 where, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodi-
17 cals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries
18 by attorneys in the field service, (1)~~$1,830,632~~ *$1,930,632,*
19 together with such amounts from other appropriations or au-
20 thorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for
21 the fiscal year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts
22 or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary,
23 not exceeding a total of $340,000, shall be transferred to
24 and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be
25 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia

not to exceed (2)~~$1,015,000~~ *$1,063,000: Provided, however,* that if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $506,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $251,179, shall be transferred to and made a part

1 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts
2 not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes
3 enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District
4 of Columbia, $587,955; for preparation and display of
5 exhibits, $46,625 and the preparation, distribution, and dis-
6 play of motion and sound pictures, $59,500, including co-
7 operation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other
8 agencies: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
9 of the appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal
10 year 1945 from which transfers to this appropriation
11 are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below
12 the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget
13 for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred
14 therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which
15 may be expended for personal services in the District of
16 Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts
17 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing
18 thereon with representatives of the Department, shall
19 determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed
20 by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or
21 authorizations: *Provided further,* That when and to (3)~~the~~
22 *this* extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural
23 exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the
24 authorized programs of the various agencies of the Depart-
25 ment can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or

1 distributed by the Office of Information, as the central
2 agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not
3 exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred
4 to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds
5 applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified
6 herein, including personal services in the District of Colum-
7 bia: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion
8 pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a
9 total of $10,000 may be used for the temporary employment,
10 by contract or otherwise, of specialists, technicians, and
11 experts, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as
12 amended: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall
13 be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or
14 State field offices or for the compensation of employees in
15 such offices except that not to exceed $13,900 may be used
16 to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

17 PRINTING AND BINDING

18 For all printing and binding for the Department, includ-
19 ing all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located
20 in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere, except
21 as otherwise in ~~the~~ *this* Act provided, $1,100,000, includ-
22 ing the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles
23 published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of
24 the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895
25 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915

1 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108),
2 and in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44
3 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000
4 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests
5 of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal
6 proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or
7 sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Sena-
8 tors, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they
9 shall direct, but not including work done at the field print-
10 ing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint
11 Committee on Printing, in accordance with the Act ap-
12 proved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided,*
13 That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from
14 the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agri-
15 cultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary
16 for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas
17 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from
18 funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section
19 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as
20 amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and
21 binding in connection with the activities under said section
22 32, and from funds appropriated for "Salaries and expenses,
23 War Food Administration", such sums as may be necessary
24 for printing and binding in connection with functions as-
25 signed to the Office of Information by the War Food Admin-

1 istrator: *Provided further,* That the total amount that may
2 be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding
3 proviso shall not exceed $385,000.

4 LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 Salaries and expenses: For purchase and exchange of
6 reference books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books,
7 periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imper-
8 fect series; not to exceed $1,200 for newspapers; for dues,
9 when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership
10 in societies or associations which issue publications to mem-
11 bers only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers
12 who are not members; for salaries in the city of Washing-
13 ton and elsewhere; for official travel expenses, and for library
14 fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary
15 expenses, $543,233, together with such amounts from other
16 appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
17 schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such
18 salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions
19 thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceed-
20 ing a total of $750, shall be transferred to and made a part
21 of this appropriation, of which total appropriation not to
22 exceed $369,070, may be expended for personal services in
23 the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That if the total
24 amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal
25 year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts

estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to make copies of bibliographies prepared by the Department library. microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books and other library materials in the Department and sell such bibliographies and reproductions at such prices (not less than estimated cost of furnishing same) as he may determine, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in cooperation with public agencies or organizations, including not to exceed (4)~~$2,150,000~~ *$2,181,655* for personal services in the District of Columbia, (5)*including the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum,* and not to exceed

$1,000 for the purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

Economic investigations: For acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, for conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities of the Department, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, (6)~~$2,325,236~~ *$2,475,236*, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $245,377 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts

1 estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
2 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this ap-
3 propriation and the amount which may be expended for per-
4 sonal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or
5 decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of
6 the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of
7 the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the
8 requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in
9 such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,*
10 That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made
11 available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be
12 used for State and county land-use planning.

13 Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling,
14 abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and pub-
15 lishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and
16 livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,
17 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
18 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooper-
19 ation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State,
20 and local agencies, and for the collection and publication of
21 statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June
22 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957),
23 $1,500,000, together with such amounts from other appro-
24 priations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules
25 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and

1 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
2 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
3 $175,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this
4 appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts
5 of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year
6 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts esti-
7 mated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the
8 amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this
9 appropriation and the amount which may be expended for
10 personal services in the District of Columbia shall be in-
11 creased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the
12 Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with repre-
13 sentatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate
14 to the requirements as changed by such reductions or in-
15 creases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided*
16 *further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be
17 available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating,
18 or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the
19 acreage to be planted in cotton: *Provided further,* That esti-
20 mates of apple production shall be confined to the commercial
21 crop.

22 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL
23 RELATIONS

24 Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the functions
25 of the Secretary under the Act of June 5, 1930, as amended

1 (7 U. S. C. 541–545), independently and in cooperation
2 with other branches of the Government, State agencies, pur-
3 chasing and consuming organizations and persons engaged in
4 the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution
5 of farm and food products, and for enabling the Secretary
6 to discharge his functions as a member of the joint Great
7 Britain-United States board known as the Combined Food
8 Board, including the employment of persons and means in
9 the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase of
10 such books and periodicals and not to exceed $500 for news-
11 papers as may be necessary in connection with this work,
12 $481,505.

13 INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL
14 COMMITTEES

15 Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the ap-
16 propriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment
17 Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United
18 States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory
19 Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events
20 or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural sur-
21 pluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, to-
22 gether with traveling and other necessary expenses relating
23 thereto.

1 EXTENSION SERVICE

2 PAYMENTS TO STATES; HAWAII; ALASKA; AND PUERTO RICO

3 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and
4 Puerto Rico for cooperative agricultural extension work as
5 follows:

6 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:
7 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
8 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
9 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935
10 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; additional extension
11 work, the Act approved April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 589),
12 $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929
13 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-
14 Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3
15 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),
16 extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the
17 Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950;
18 Puerto Rico, the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
19 343f–343g) extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bank-
20 head-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $140,000; in all, Capper-
21 Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $14,198,950.

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 Administration and coordination of extension work: For
24 the employment of persons and means in the District of

1 Columbia and elsewhere to enable the Secretary to adminis-
2 ter the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8,
3 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or sup-
4 plementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work
5 of the Department and the several States, Territories, and
6 insular possessions, including cooperation with other bureaus
7 and offices of the Department, and Federal, State, county,
8 and other agencies, in the development, preparation, and
9 distribution of educational material designed to increase the
10 effectiveness of cooperative extension work as conducted by
11 the Department in cooperation with land-grant colleges,
12 $748,843, of which amount not to exceed $632,610 may be
13 expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

14 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

15 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

16 Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and ex-
17 penses of the Office of Administrator, (7)*including the salary*
18 *of the Administrator at $9,200 per annum,* and personal
19 services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

20 SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

21 For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the
22 provisions of an Act entitled "An Act to provide for research
23 into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to
24 provide for the further development of cooperative agricul-
25 tural extension work and the more complete endowment and

1 support of land-grant colleges", approved June 29, 1935
2 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f); for administration of
3 the provisions of section 5 of the said Act, and for special
4 research work, including the planning, programing, co-
5 ordination, and printing the results of such research, to be
6 conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secre-
7 tary may designate or establish, and to which he may make
8 allotments from this fund, including the employment of
9 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
10 $1,226,364, of which amount $742,315 shall be available
11 for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories
12 and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for
13 by section 4 of said Act.

14 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

15 PAYMENT TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

16 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
17 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect
18 the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural
19 experiment stations:

20 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
21 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S.
22 C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act,
23 the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
24 $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24.

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,463,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $22,500; in all, for Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,001,208: *Provided,* That in order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population, $63,708 of the appropriation in this paragraph under the Bankhead-Jones Act shall be available for allotment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For salaries and expenses, including personal

1 services in the District of Columbia, necessary to enable the
2 Secretary to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved
3 March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May
4 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June
5 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–
6 363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration
7 and for the administration of an agricultural experiment sta-
8 tion in Puerto Rico, $176,169, of which not to exceed
9 $166,122 may be expended for personal services in the
10 District of Columbia; and the Secretary shall prescribe the
11 form of the annual financial statement required under
12 the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are
13 in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the re-
14 search work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment
15 stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research
16 of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon
17 to Congress.

18 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: To enable
19 the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural
20 experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation,
21 illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and
22 not to exceed $8,000 for the erection and alteration of
23 buildings, $107,074; and the Secretary is authorized to
24 sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to
25 the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and

1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,463,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $22,500; in all, for Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,001,208: *Provided,* That in order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population, $63,708 of the appropriation in this paragraph under the Bankhead-Jones Act shall be available for allotment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For salaries and expenses, including personal

1 services in the District of Columbia, necessary to enable the
2 Secretary to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved
3 March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May
4 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June
5 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–
6 363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration
7 and for the administration of an agricultural experiment sta-
8 tion in Puerto Rico, $176,169, of which not to exceed
9 $166,122 may be expended for personal services in the
10 District of Columbia; and the Secretary shall prescribe the
11 form of the annual financial statement required under
12 the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are
13 in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the re-
14 search work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment
15 stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research
16 of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon
17 to Congress.

18 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: To enable
19 the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural
20 experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation,
21 illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and
22 not to exceed $8,000 for the erection and alteration of
23 buildings, $107,074; and the Secretary is authorized to
24 sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to
25 the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and

1 the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered
2 into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
3 receipts.

4 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For the employment of persons and means in the District
7 of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
8 $712,955 for departmental personal services in the
9 District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions
10 of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal
11 Industry, and related Acts; and the Secretary, upon applica-
12 tion of any exporter, importer, packer, or owner of, or the
13 agent thereof, or dealer in, livestock, hides, skins, meat, or
14 other animal products, may in his discretion, make inspec-
15 tions and examinations at places other than the headquarters
16 of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge
17 the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence in-
18 curred for such inspections and examinations, the funds
19 derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury
20 of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from
21 which the expenses are paid; collect and disseminate infor-
22 mation concerning livestock and animal products; prepare
23 and disseminate reports on animal industry; purchase in the
24 open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins,
25 or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture,

which are sold in the United States, for the detection, prevention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals, test the same, and disseminate the results of said tests in such manner as he may deem best, and purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals, including poultry, or quarantine the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, contagious poultry diseases, or other diseases of animals from one State to another, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $195,379.

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations and other agencies, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings necessary to carry on the experiments (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one building), $899,500.

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, including the alteration and construction of necessary (8)~~buildings,~~ *buildings* at Beltsville, Maryland (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one building), and necessary expenses for investigations of tuber-

1 culin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $756,939:
2 *Provided*, That fees shall be charged for all diagnoses in con-
3 nection with rabies, except those performed for agencies of
4 the United States Government, in such amounts as the
5 Secretary shall prescribe, and such fees shall be covered
6 into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

7 Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the
8 control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and
9 paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's
10 disease of cattle, (9)~~$5,240,355~~ *$5,433,232*, together with
11 not to exceed $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the ap-
12 propriation for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided*, That in carry-
13 ing out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of
14 the Secretary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy
15 tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the
16 test for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been de-
17 stroyed, condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his
18 discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations
19 as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or
20 elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary
21 for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals
22 but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money
23 hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners
24 of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary
25 to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or

1 municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take
2 place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as com-
3 pensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time
4 of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof,
5 it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm,
6 or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered
7 for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That
8 out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compen-
9 sation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed
10 one-third of the difference between the appraised value of
11 such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no pay-
12 ment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid
13 by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the
14 animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any
15 payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal
16 or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

17 Hog-cholera control: For the control and eradication of
18 hog cholera and related swine diseases, by such means as
19 may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation
20 of organizations, and other methods, either independently
21 or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county
22 authorities, (10)~~$114,288~~ *$115,440*.

23 Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quaran-
24 tine work, including the eradication of southern cattle ticks,
25 scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the inspec-

tion of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the mallein testing of animals, (11)~~$951,253~~ *$1,003,130.*

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food products, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to public printing, (12)~~$8,616,759~~ *$9,359,124.*

Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals, (13)~~$272,115~~ *$279,228.*

Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus and serum: The sum of (14)~~$37,007~~ *$38,444* of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made avail-

able during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuro-pneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to exceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided*, That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be

1 made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding
2 value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value
3 no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its
4 meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary
5 emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment
6 by the United States Government for any animals shall not
7 exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further,*
8 That the sum of $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the
9 appropriation of $3,500,000 contained in the Second De-
10 ficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1924, approved De-
11 cember 5, 1924, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth
12 disease and other contagious or infectious diseases of animals,
13 is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which
14 appropriations are herein made to enable the Secretary to
15 control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar
16 diseases in poultry.

17 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
19 ing not to exceed $410,345 for personal services in the
20 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in
21 carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924
22 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experi-
23 ments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative
24 investigations of the dairy industry in the various States,
25 for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Acts of

May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c), 2327 (b)), and August 10, 1912 (26 U. S. C. 2327 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, repairs to buildings, and not to exceed $10,000 for the construction or alteration of buildings, $812,958.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the investigation of fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton, tobacco, vegetables, grasses, forage, drug, medicinal, poisonous, fiber, and other plants and plant industries, of soils and soil-plant relationships, and of the application of engineering principles to agriculture, in cooperation with other branches of the Department, the State experiment stations, and practical farmers; for the erection or alteration of necessary farm buildings and buildings at the National Arboretum: (15) ~~*Provided,* That the cost of any building erected or altered, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500~~ *Provided, That the cost of erecting any one building, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater*; and for

1 the employment of persons and means in the city of Washing-
2 ton and elsewhere required for the investigations, experi-
3 ments, and demonstrations herein authorized, as follows:

4 General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses
5 for general administrative purposes, including the salary of
6 Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District
7 of Columbia, $225,000.

8 Agricultural engineering investigations: For investiga-
9 tions, experiments, and demonstrations involving the appli-
10 cation of engineering principles to agriculture; for investi-
11 gating and reporting upon the different kinds of farm power
12 and appliances; upon farm domestic water supply and sewage
13 disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings
14 and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and
15 storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical
16 farm equipment and rural electrification, upon the engineer-
17 ing problems relating to the processing, transportation, and
18 storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and
19 upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical
20 characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm
21 machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the
22 Act approved April 19, 1930 (7 U. S. C. 424, 425); for
23 giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural and chem-
24 ical engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the
25 results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and dis-

1 tributing bulletins, plans, and reports, (16)~~$293,639~~ *$378,-*
2 *639* (17)*, of which (notwithstanding the above limitation*
3 *upon buildings) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for*
4 *the construction of a building at the Houma (Louisiana)*
5 *station.*

6 Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and
7 improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of
8 cereal production and for the study and control of cereal
9 diseases, for the investigation of the cultivation and breed-
10 ing of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax
11 diseases, for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn
12 and methods of broomcorn production, and for determining
13 the distribution of weeds and means for their control,
14 (18)~~$645,596~~ *$650,524.*

15 Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: For investiga-
16 tion of the production of cotton and other fiber crops, including
17 the improvement by cultural methods, breeding, and selec-
18 tion, fiber yield and quality, cotton soil-fertility, and the
19 control of diseases, $456,702, of which sum not less than
20 $14,700 shall be used for experimenting in Sea Island cotton,
21 including its hybridization with other varieties.

22 Drug and related plants: For the investigation, testing,
23 and improvement of plants yielding drugs, spices, poisons,
24 oils, and related products and byproducts, $70,308.

25 Dry-land agriculture: For the investigation and im-

1 provement of methods of crop production under subhumid,
2 semiarid, or dry-land conditions, (19)~~$245,000~~ *$257,563*:
3 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for
4 the establishment of any new field station.

5 Forage crops and diseases: For the investigation and
6 improvement of forage crops, including grasses, alfalfas,
7 clovers, soybeans, lespedezas, vetches, cowpeas, field peas,
8 and miscellaneous legumes; for the investigation of green-
9 manure crops and cover crops; for investigations looking to
10 the improvement of pastures; and for the investigation of
11 forage-crop diseases and methods of control, $327,837.

12 Forest pathology: For the investigation of diseases of
13 forest and shade trees and forest products, including a study
14 of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi, bacteria,
15 viruses, and other causes of such diseases, for the purpose of
16 developing methods of control and eradication and deter-
17 mining their application, $255,300.

18 Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: For investiga-
19 tion and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of
20 culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activi-
21 ties concerned with the production of fruits, nuts, vegetables,
22 ornamentals, and related plants, for investigation of methods
23 of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing and utilizing these
24 products, and for studies of the physiological and related
25 changes of such products during processes of marketing and

1 while in commercial storage, (20)~~$1,458,877~~ *$1,463,877.*

2 Irrigation agriculture: For investigations of crop pro-
3 duction on irrigable lands, the quality of irrigation water
4 and its use by crops, and methods for improving and
5 maintaining the productivity of irrigated soils, $145,000.

6 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and devel-
7 opment of the National Arboretum established under the
8 provisions of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Sec-
9 retary of Agriculture to establish a National Arboretum, and
10 for other purposes", approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C..
11 191–194), employment of persons and means in the city of
12 Washington and elsewhere, and travel expenses of em-
13 ployees and advisory council, $31,500, of which not to
14 exceed $2,500 may be expended by contract or otherwise
15 for the services of consulting landscape architects without
16 reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or
17 civil-service rules.

18 Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: For
19 investigations in seed and plant introduction, including the
20 study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and dis-
21 tribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs,
22 vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from
23 our possessions, and also wild native plants, for experiments
24 with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this
25 country, for plant-disease investigations, including nema-

1 tology, and for plant and plant-disease collections and
2 surveys, (21)~~$290,000~~ *$298,913.*

3 Plant Industry Experiment Farm: For the maintenance
4 of a general experiment farm and agricultural station in the
5 vicinity of Beltsville, Maryland, $56,976.

6 Soil and fertilizer investigations: For soil and fertilizer
7 investigations, including soil minerals, soil organic matter, soil
8 solution, soil physical and chemical investigations, soil micro-
9 biology, including the testing of cultures procured in the open
10 market for inoculating legumes, other crops, or soil, and if
11 any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or mis-
12 branded, the results of the tests may be published, together
13 with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by
14 whom the cultures were offered for sale; for investigations
15 of the causes of soil infertility and the maintenance of soil
16 productivity; and for investigations within the United States
17 of fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, including phosphoric acid
18 and potash, and other soil amendments, and their suitability
19 for agricultural use, $346,791.

20 Soil survey: For the investigation of soils and their
21 origin, for survey of the extent of classes and types, and
22 for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise,
23 the results of such investigations and surveys, (22)~~$162,582~~
24 *$174,582.*

25 Sugar-plant investigations: For sugar-plant investiga-

tions, including studies of diseases and the improvement of sugar beets and sugar-beet seed, sugarcane, and other sugar-producing plants, cultural and production methods, and the improvement and maintenance of soil fertility in relation to sugar plants, $370,000.

Tobacco investigations: For the investigation and improvement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production and handling, (23)~~$131,020~~ *$143,520.*

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses connected with investigations, experiments, and demonstrations for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for investigating and importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 146, 147, 151–167, 281, 282), to conduct other activities hereinafter authorized, and for the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests, independently or in cooperation with

1 other branches of the Federal Government, States, counties,
2 municipalities, corporations, agencies, individuals, or with
3 foreign governments; including the employment of necessary
4 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
5 of which not to exceed $633,886 may be expended for
6 personal services in the District of Columbia, rent, con-
7 struction, alteration, or repair of necessary buildings outside
8 the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That, unless otherwise
9 specifically provided, the cost for the construction or altera-
10 tion of any building shall not exceed $1,500 and the total
11 amount expended for such construction in any one year shall
12 not exceed $7,000, as follows:

13 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
14 trative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau
15 and other personal services, $160,920.

16 Fruit insects: For insects affecting fruits, grapes, and
17 nuts, $457,230.

18 Japanese beetle control: For the control and preven-
19 tion of spread of the Japanese beetle, $400,000: *Provided,*
20 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the
21 cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

22 Sweetpotato weevil control: For the determination and
23 application of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils
24 as, in the judgment of the Secretary, may be necessary,
25 $78,670: *Provided,* That in the discretion of the Secre-

1 tary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the
2 control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State
3 has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this pur-
4 pose: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation
5 shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm
6 crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

7 Mexican fruitfly control: For the control and prevention
8 of spread of the Mexican fruitfly, including necessary surveys
9 and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the
10 Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $169,820.

11 (24)*Citrus canker eradication: For determining and apply-*
12 *ing such methods of eradication or control of the disease of*
13 *citrus trees known as citrus canker as in the judgment of the*
14 *Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation with such*
15 *authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers,*
16 *or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such*
17 *purposes, $11,300: Provided, That no part of the money*
18 *herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of*
19 *trees or other property injured or destroyed.*

20 Gypsy and brown-tail moth control: For the control
21 and prevention of spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths,
22 $409,320.

23 Dutch elm disease control: For determining and apply-
24 ing methods of control and prevention of spread of the
25 disease of elm trees known as "Dutch elm disease" and of

1 a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley,
2 $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided,* That, in
3 the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this
4 appropriation shall be made for applying methods of con-
5 trol of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures
6 for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal
7 lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force,
8 provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential
9 or appropiate for the carrying on of the control program,
10 nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures
11 shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by
12 State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organi-
13 zations concerned: *Provided further,* That expenditures in-
14 curred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not
15 be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions,
16 or contributions: *Provided further,* That no part of this ap-
17 propriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction
18 of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where
19 such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the
20 Government of the United States, or on property included
21 within local experimental control areas: *Provided further,*
22 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost
23 or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.
24 Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication: For deter-
25 mining and applying such methods of eradication, control,

1 and prevention of spread of the diseases of peach trees known
2 as "phony peach" and "peach mosaic" as in the judgment
3 of the Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation
4 with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations
5 of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to
6 accomplish such purposes, including the certification of prod-
7 ucts out of the infested areas to meet the requirements of
8 State quarantines, $99,340: *Provided*, That no part of the
9 money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or
10 value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

11 Forest insects: For insects affecting forests and forest
12 products, under section 4 of the Act approved May 22, 1928
13 (16 U. S. C. 581c), entitled "An Act to insure adequate
14 supplies of timber and other forest products for the people
15 of the United States, to promote the full use for timber grow-
16 ing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States,
17 including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not
18 suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correla-
19 tion and the most economical conduct of forest research in
20 the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforest-
21 ation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest eco-
22 nomics, and related subjects", and for insects affecting orna-
23 mental trees and shrubs, $202,000.

24 Truck crop and garden insects: For insects affecting truck

1 crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco,
2 sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $326,340.
3 Cereal and forage insects: For insects affecting cereal
4 and forage crops, including sugarcane and rice, and including
5 research on the European corn borer, $403,370.
6 Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the com-
7 mon barberry and for applying such other methods of
8 eradication, control, and prevention of spread of cereal
9 rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary
10 to accomplish such purposes, (25)~~$258,470~~ *$283,470: Pro-*
11 *vided,* That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no expendi-
12 tures from this appropriation shall be made for these purposes
13 until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall
14 have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States,
15 counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organiza-
16 tions for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*
17 *further,* That no part of the money herein appropriated
18 shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured
19 or destroyed.
20 Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $163,730.
21 Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the
22 control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil
23 and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such
24 cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any
25 infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations

in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $738,960.

Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and the propagation and distribution by sale of surplus bee-breeding stock, $91,950: *Provided,* That the rates at which such sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting man, household possessions, and animals, $175,000.

Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identification and classification of insects, including taxonomic, morphological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other agencies concerned with insect-pest control, $145,000.

Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in connection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods, (26)~~$20,000~~ *$30,000.*

Control investigations: For developing equipment or apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication and control of plant pests, determining methods of disinfecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests,

1 determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases
2 of insect-pest control, $76,485, of which not less than
3 $10,000 shall be used for methyl bromide investigations.
4 Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the inves-
5 tigation and development of methods of manufacturing
6 insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical
7 problems relating to the composition, action, and applica-
8 tion of insecticides and fungicides, $130,520.
9 Transit inspection: For the inspection in transit or
10 otherwise of articles quarantined under the Act of August
11 20, 1912 (7 U. S. C. 161, 164a), as amended, and for the
12 interception and disposition of materials found to have been
13 transported interstate in violation of quarantines promulgated
14 thereunder, $45,900.
15 Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign
16 plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export,
17 and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from
18 Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of
19 the entry into the United States of railway cars and other
20 vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials
21 from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection
22 thereof, including construction and repair of necessary build-
23 ings, plants, and equipment, for the fumigation, disinfection,
24 or cleaning of products, railway cars, or other vehicles enter-
25 ing the United States from Mexico, $797,700: *Provided,*

1 That any moneys received in payment of charges fixed by
2 the Secretary on account of such cleaning and disinfection
3 shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
4 Certification of exports: For the inspection, under such
5 rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, of
6 domestic plants and plant products when offered for export
7 and to certify to shippers and interested parties as to the
8 freedom of such products from injurious plant diseases and
9 insect pests according to the sanitary requirements of the
10 foreign countries affected and to make such reasonable
11 charges and to use such means as may be necessary to ac-
12 complish this object, $34,480: *Provided,* That moneys
13 received on account of such inspection and certification shall
14 be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

15 CONTROL OF INCIPIENT AND EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF
16 INSECT PESTS AND PLANT DISEASES

17 Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect
18 pests and plant diseases: To enable the Secretary to carry
19 out the provisions of and for expenditures authorized by
20 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C.
21 148–148e), including surveys and control operations in
22 Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or
23 local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian
24 citizens, $2,700,000.

1 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations
4 hereinafter authorized, independently or in cooperation with
5 other branches of the Department, other departments or
6 agencies of the Federal Government, States, State agricul-
7 tural experiment stations, universities, and other State
8 agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business,
9 farm, or other organizations and corporations, individuals,
10 associations, and scientific societies, including the employ-
11 ment of necessary persons and means in the city of Wash-
12 ington and elsewhere, of which not to exceed $198,280 may
13 be expended for personal services in the District of Colum-
14 bia; and for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings out-
15 side the District of Columbia (27)~~at a total cost not to exceed~~
16 ~~$15,000,~~ *: Provided, That the cost of erecting any one build-*
17 *ing shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any*
18 *one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 per*
19 *centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary,*
20 *whichever is greater*, as follows:

21 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
22 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
23 salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the
24 District of Columbia, $82,250.

25 Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the

1 investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862
2 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of
3 chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physi-
4 cal, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods,
5 feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances
6 used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the
7 physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of
8 such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and
9 development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar
10 sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural
11 materials for such purposes; for the technological investiga-
12 tion of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen
13 pack investigations; and to cooperate with associations and
14 scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis,
$313,411.

15 Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of
16 naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components;
17 the investigation and experimental demonstration of im-
18 proved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval
19 stores; the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and
20 utilization of naval stores; and for the assembling and com-
21 pilation of data on production, distribution, and consumption
22 of turpentine and rosin, pursuant to the Act of August 15,
23 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), $112,100.

24 Regional research laboratories: For continuing the
25 researches established under the provisions of section 202

1 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II, and subject to the
2 provisions of section 393 of title III, of the Agricultural
3 Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292, 1393),
4 including research on food products of farm commodities,
5 $4,244,600.

6 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

7 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
8 ing not to exceed $290,400 for personal services in the
9 District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition
10 and Home Economics for conducting either independently
11 or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of
12 the relative utility and economy of agricultural products
13 for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special
14 suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective
15 utilization of such products for these purposes, and such
16 economic investigations, including housing and household
17 buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the
18 rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this
19 subject, $806,630.

20 BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER

21 For general administrative purposes, including main-
22 tenance, operation, (28)~~construction,~~ *construction* or altera-
23 tion of necessary buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500
24 (29)~~for any one building~~, repairs, and other expenses,
25 $130,760: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the

1 time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance
2 credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual
3 charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges,
4 including handling and other related services, for equipment
5 rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs);
6 for services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished,
7 stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for
8 building construction, alteration, and repair performed by the
9 Center in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appro-
10 priations and the applicable appropriations may also be
11 charged their proportionate share of the necessary general ex-
12 penses of the Center not covered by this appropriation.

13 WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

14 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
15 out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act for forest pro-
16 tection against the white pine blister rust, approved April
17 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), and in accordance with the
18 provisions thereof, including the employment of persons and
19 means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,264,026;
20 of which amount $203,173 shall be available to the
21 Department of the Interior for control of white pine
22 blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the juris-
23 diction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which
24 are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of
25 the United States; $1,219,900 of said amount to the

1 Forest Service for the control of white pine blister
2 rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and
3 $840,953 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology
4 and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordina-
5 tion of the entire program, method development, and
6 for operations conducted under its direction for such con-
7 trol, including, but not confined to, cooperation with
8 individual States, local authorites and private agencies in the
9 control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State
10 and privately owned lands.

11 FOREST SERVICE

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For the employment of persons and means in the
14 District of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed
15 (30)~~$887,074~~ *$952,611* for departmental personal services
16 in the District of Columbia, and to enable the Secretary to
17 experiment and to make and continue investigations and
18 report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering,
19 but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experi-
20 ment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United
21 States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper
22 care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and
23 timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative
24 treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the
25 planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the

1 treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That
2 the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,
3 exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply
4 or sanitary system and of connecting the same with
5 any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower
6 upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not
7 exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected,
8 purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or
9 more, may be improved out of the appropriations made
10 under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to
11 exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified
12 by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the
13 national forests, including tree planting and other measures
14 to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the
15 formation of floods, and to conserve water and including
16 the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary
17 for information leading to the arrest and conviction for
18 violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or
19 near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury
20 to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions
21 upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care
22 for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or
23 the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate
24 the results of experiments and investigations made by the
25 Forest Service; to purchase lawbooks, reference and tech-

1 nical books, and technical journals for officers of the Forest
2 Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical
3 supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the
4 immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees
5 engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service:
6 *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,500 may be
7 expended for the contribution of the United States to the
8 cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Union
9 of Forest Research Stations and of the Department of
10 Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois:
11 *Provided further,* That the appropriations for the work of
12 the Forest Service shall be available for meeting the expenses
13 of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and
14 handling of supplies, equipment, and materials stored therein
15 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Forest
16 Service and for sale and distribution to other Government
17 activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate
18 with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written
19 cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment,
20 and materials, including the cost of supervision, transporta-
21 tion, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appro-
22 priations current at the time additional supplies and materials
23 are procured for warehouse stocks: *Provided further,* That
24 the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service avail-
25 able for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replace-

1 ment of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for
2 use of such equipment on projects of the Forest Service
3 chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other
4 Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reim-
5 bursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the
6 work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief
7 Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation,
8 repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment manage-
9 ment control, and credited to appropriations currently avail-
10 able at the time adjustment is effected: *Provided further,*
11 That the Forest Service may rent equipment for fire-control
12 purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal
13 agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control
14 under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the
15 amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropria-
16 tions currently available at the time payment is received,
17 as follows:

18 General administrative expenses: For necessary ex-
19 penses for general administrative purposes, including the
20 salary of the Chief Forester (31) *at $9,200 per annum,* for
21 the necessary expenses of the National Forest Reservation
22 Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March
23 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), and for other personal services
24 in the District of Columbia, $625,000.

1 National forest protection and management: For the
2 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
3 and development of the national forests, including the
4 establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries,
5 including the procurement of three seed and nursery stock by
6 purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree plant-
7 ing and the care of plantations and young growth; the
8 maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract
9 or otherwise, with authority to renew any contract for
10 such purpose annually, not more than twice, without addi-
11 tional advertising; the maintenance of roads and trails and
12 the construction and maintenance of all other improvements
13 necessary for the proper and economical administration,
14 protection, development, and use of the national forests,
15 including experimental areas under Forest Service administra-
16 tion, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary,
17 direct purchases will be more economical than construction,
18 improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to
19 exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and
20 maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control
21 of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cul-
22 tural operations; development and application of fish
23 and game management plans; propagation and transplant-
24 ing of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions
25 of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber

1 and other resources and development and application
2 of plans for their effective management, sale, and use;
3 acceptance of moneys from timber purchasers for de-
4 posit into the Treasury in the trust account, Forest Service
5 Cooperative Fund, which moneys are hereby appropriated
6 and made available until expended for scaling services
7 requested by purchasers in addition to those required by the
8 Forest Service, and for refunds of amounts deposited in
9 excess of the cost of such work; examination, classification,
10 surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting ex-
11 changes authorized by law and of lands within the
12 boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to
13 homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11,
14 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–
15 509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C.
16 512); investigation and establishment of water rights,
17 including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in
18 lands or rights-of-ways for use and protection of water
19 rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the admin-
20 istration and public use of the national forests; and all
21 expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement,
22 protection, and general administration of the national forests,
23 including lands under contract for purchase or for the
24 acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been
25 instituted under the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C.

521), and the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499, 505, 564–570), lands transferred by authority of the Secretary from the Resettlement Administration to the Forest Service, and lands transferred to the Forest Service under authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, $17,729,426: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of persons who have lost their lives as a result of fighting fires while employed by the Forest Service: *Provided further,* That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood, and other forest products the amounts made available for schools and roads by the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C. 500), and the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501), shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and unappropriated public forest lands, $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States,

to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects", approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), as follows:

Forest management: Fire, silvicultural, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, at forest experiment stations or elsewhere, (32)~~$498,848~~ *$513,848.*

Range investigations: Investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, (33)~~$288,475~~ *$323,475.*

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, (34)~~$1,092,519~~ *$1,147,519.*

Forest survey: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, $156,246.

Forest economics: Investigations in forest economics under section 10, (35)~~$74,018~~ *$84,018.*

Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at

1 forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and
2 demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover char-
3 acteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water
4 conservation, flood control, stream-flow regulation, erosion,
5 climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for de-
6 veloping preventive and control measures therefor, $86,762.

7 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

8 For cooperation with the various States or other ap-
9 propriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression
10 and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accord-
11 ance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act en-
12 titled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for
13 the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of
14 national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote
15 the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable
16 therefor", approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C.
17 564–570), (36)~~$2,500,000 and in addition thereto $29,062~~
18 ~~to carry out the provisions of the War Overtime Pay Act of~~
19 ~~1943; in all, $2,529,062~~ (37)*including also not to exceed*
20 *$50,000 for the study of the effect of tax laws and the investi-*
21 *gation of timber insurance as provided in section 3 of said*
22 *Act*, (38)*$6,300,000*, of which not to exceed (39)~~$64,226~~
23 *$84,381* and $5,000 shall be available for personal services
24 and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively,
25 in the District of Columbia (40): *Provided, That the Secre-*

1 *tary may authorize expenditures not to exceed $1,000,000*
2 *from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest*
3 *fires on critical areas of national importance without re-*
4 *quiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners.*

5 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

6 To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect,
7 through such agencies of the Department as he may desig-
8 nate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act,
9 approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to
10 exceed $532,038) and the provisions of sections 4 (not
11 to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,728),
12 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection
13 of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for
14 the extension of national forests, and for other purposes,
15 in order to promote the continuous production of timber
16 on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7,
17 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary
18 thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate
19 with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-
20 using industries or other appropriate agencies in the
21 application of forest management principles to federally
22 owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so
23 as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation
24 of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and
25 the stabilization of employment and economic continuance

1 of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not
2 to exceed $781,466, of which not to exceed $50,958 may
3 be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia;
4 the purchase of reference books and technical journals;
5 not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or
6 purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements:
7 *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation which is avail-
8 able for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and
9 sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924,
10 shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the
11 State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or in-
12 dividuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that
13 to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make
14 contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to
15 be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further,* That any
16 part of this appropriation allocated for the production or
17 procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds
18 appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to co-
19 operating States for the production or procurement of nursery
20 stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more
21 than three fiscal years: *Provided further,* That in carrying
22 into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry
23 Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish
24 new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such
25 new nurseries.

1 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

2 For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions
3 of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16
4 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, of which not to exceed
5 $20,030 may be expended for personal services in the Dis-
6 trict of Columbia.

7 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

8 For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the
9 Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23
10 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and
11 maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under
12 Forest Service administration, including not to exceed
13 $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
14 $4,161,496 for forest development roads and trails, to be
15 immediately available and to remain available until expended:
16 *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for the
17 rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings
18 necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and sup-
19 plies used for road and trail construction and maintenance,
20 but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered,
21 or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed
22 $7,500.

23 EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

24 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
25 carry into effect the Act of March 5, 1942, as amended

1 (7 U. S. C. 171–175), including personal services in the
2 District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding
3 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and
5 periodicals; purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; erection
6 of necessary buildings; procurement of medical supplies or
7 services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance
8 of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, and furnish-
9 ing to employees daily transportation between points of
10 assembly and work projects. (41)~~including the cost of pro-~~
11 ~~gressive and final liquidation of all of said project during the~~
12 ~~fiscal year 1945,~~ there is hereby continued available, in
13 accordance with section 3 of said Act of March 5, 1942,
14 not to exceed (42)~~$3,952,585~~ *$3,020,985* of the unobligated
15 balances of appropriations made under this head for the fiscal
16 years 1942 and 1943, which balances shall be merged with
17 the appropriation made under this head in the Department of
18 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided*, That any
19 proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from
20 guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales,
21 rentals, and fees resulting from operations under such Act
22 of March 5, 1942, as amended, shall be covered into the
23 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

24 WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

25 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable

1 the War Food Administration to perform its functions, in-
2 cluding those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310,
3 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by
4 transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private
5 agencies and individuals, other personal services in the
6 District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with
7 the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and com-
8 pensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjust-
9 ment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the tem-
10 porary employment of persons or organizations by contract
11 or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of
12 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary
13 expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of sub-
14 sistence, of persons serving while away from their perma-
15 nent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by
16 the War Food Administration, without other compensation
17 from the United States, except that such expenditures shall
18 not exceed $200,000; (43) *upon authorization or approval*
19 *of the War Food Administrator, travel expenses to and*
20 *from their homes or regular places of business in accordance*
21 *with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations not*
22 *to exceed $20,000, including travel in privately owned auto-*
23 *mobiles, of persons employed intermittently away from their*
24 *homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiv-*
25 *ing compensation on a per diem when actually employed*

basis; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; (44)~~$29,200,000~~ *$30,700,000*: *Provided,* That the applicable appropriations available to the War Food Administration, current at the time services are rendered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or estimated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration, incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products (45), *excepting walnuts,* for administration of such orders: (46)~~*Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization~~ *Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a substantial number of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration.*

1 COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

2 Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed
3 (47)~~$5,458,526~~ *$7,208,526* of the funds of the Commodity
4 Credit Corporation shall be available for administrative ex-
5 penses of the Corporation in carrying out its activities as
6 authorized by law, including personal services in the District
7 of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance
8 with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and
9 the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833);
10 printing and binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not
11 to exceed $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; pro-
12 curement of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the
13 District of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative
14 expenses: *Provided,* That all necessary expenses (including
15 legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis,
16 but not including other personal services) in connection with
17 the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dis-
18 position of any real or personal property belonging to the
19 Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses
20 of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as
21 nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Pro-*
22 *vided further,* That none of the fund made available by this
23 paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until
24 an appropriate appropriation account shall have been estab-
25 lished therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a

1 covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be ac-
2 counted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and
3 Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further,*
4 That none of the fund made available by this paragraph
5 shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the
6 sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks
7 of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by
8 the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable
9 price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1,
10 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–8) (48)*; and the*
11 *method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit*
12 *Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its*
13 *equivalent for $\frac{7}{8}$-inch middling cotton at the average location*
14 *used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used*
15 *for determining the parity price for $\frac{7}{8}$-inch middling cotton at*
16 *such average location for the purposes of this proviso*: *Pro-*
17 *vided further,* That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale
18 or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substan-
19 tially deteriorated in quality (49)*(or in the case of perishable*
20 *commodities if there is danger of deterioration or of accumu-*
21 *lation of stocks)* or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the
22 extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for
23 seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further,* That no
24 wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the
25 parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided*

1 *further,* That in making regional adjustments in the sale
2 price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher
3 in any area than the United States average parity price of
4 corn.

5 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL
6 LAND RESOURCES

7 For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
8 carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclu-
9 sive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act,
10 approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C.
11 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjust-
12 ment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407)
13 (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and
14 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including per-
15 sonal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not
16 to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of ex-
17 hibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and inter-
18 national fairs within the United States; purchase of
19 lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, (50)~~$290,000,000~~
20 *$250,000,000,* (51)*together with not to exceed $40,000,000*
21 *of the funds appropriated under section 32, as amended, of*
22 *the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjust-*
23 *ment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24,*
24 *1935; in all, not to exceed $290,000,000,* to remain avail-
25 able until December 31, 1945, for compliance with pro-

1 grams under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment
2 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936,
3 as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1944 pro-
4 grams carried out during the period July 1, 1943, to
5 December 31, 1944, inclusive **(52)**, *and, in addition,*
6 *$12,500,000 for making additional payments on an acreage*
7 *and pound basis for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes*
8 *determined by the War Food Administrator to be necessary*
9 *for an adequate supply of such seeds*: *Provided,* **(53)**~~That~~
10 ~~no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation~~
11 ~~in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjust-~~
12 ~~ment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-con-~~
13 ~~servation payments and payment of acreage allotment com-~~
14 ~~mitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Ad-~~
15 ~~justment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set~~
16 ~~forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulle-~~
17 ~~tin, dated February 9, 1944:~~ *Provided further,* That not to
18 exceed **(54)**~~$24,250,000~~ *$25,000,000* of said amount shall
19 be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other ad-
20 ministrative expenses for carrying out such programs **(55)**~~;~~
21 ~~but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in~~
22 ~~the schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to~~
23 ~~the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricul-~~
24 ~~tural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred~~: *Provided*
25 *further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or

made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, and (56)~~like~~ programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, fertilizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants under the 1945 program (57)~~; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States,~~ as

1 ~~determined and approved by the State Committee of the~~
2 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States~~:
3 *Provided further,* That no part of such amounts shall
4 be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and
5 other administrative expenses except for payment of ob-
6 ligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Pro-*
7 *vided further,* That the Secretary may, in his discretion,
8 from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office
9 such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative ex-
10 penses of the General Accounting Office in auditing pay-
11 ments under this item: *Provided further,* That such amount
12 shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime,
13 trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing
14 services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers
15 to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the
16 Secretary in the 1944 (58)~~and 1945~~, *1945, and 1946* pro-
17 grams under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for
18 the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government
19 agency for such materials, or services, and for the payment of
20 all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or
21 part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided*
22 *further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law,
23 persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as
24 tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United
25 States Government and who comply with the terms and condi-

1 tions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, form-
2 ulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said Act
3 of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and
4 receive payments for their participation in said program to
5 the same extent as other producers (59): *Provided further,*
6 *That the War Food Administrator is authorized and directed*
7 *to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck*
8 *crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 Agricultural*
9 *Conservation Program with respect to any farm if the War*
10 *Food Administration determines that the producer would*
11 *have been eligible for such payments except for the failure*
12 *of such producer, because of negligence of an officer or agent*
13 *of the Federal Government, to file on or before June 30,*
14 *1943, Form ACP–140, and such payments shall be made out*
15 *of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 32 of the*
16 *Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment*
17 *Act, and for other purposes', approved August 24,*
18 *1935 (49 Stat. 774)* (60)~~: *Provided further,* That no~~
19 ~~part of the funds appropriated or made available to the~~
20 ~~Agricultural Adjustment Agency or to any other bureau~~
21 ~~or agency of the Department of Agriculture shall be used~~
22 ~~to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages~~
23 ~~in any political activity or lobbying activity (including but~~
24 ~~not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign~~
25 ~~funds of political parties or to any organization, association,~~

~~corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office; distribution of, or solicitation of subscriptions to, or contributions for the distribution of publications and other literature designed to influence or aid in the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; or engaging in activities designed to influence the action of Congress with respect to appropriations or legislation of any kind except that employees may furnish to Congress any information authorized to be furnished by existing law or required by Congress, or by any of its committees or members): *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid out for the salary per diem allowance or expenses of any person, who personally or by letter demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.~~

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, there is hereby reappropriated not to exceed

1 (61) ~~$100,000~~ *$420,000* of the unobligated balance of the
2 appropriation made for this purpose for the fiscal year ending
3 June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
4 shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of
5 wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943,
6 or for any other purpose except in connection with the
7 liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton
8 crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.

9 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

10 To carry out the provisions of an Act entitled "An Act
11 to provide for the protection of land resources against soil
12 erosion, and for other purposes", approved April 27, 1935
13 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national
14 program of erosion control and soil and moisture conserva-
15 tion to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other
16 agencies, including the employment of persons and means
17 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to
18 exceed $1,089,837 may be expended for personal serv-
19 ices in the District of Columbia, purchase of books
20 and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one
21 passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia,
22 furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees,
23 and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent
24 buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased,
25 erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing

1 a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same
2 with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where
3 buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being pur-
4 chased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to
5 be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building:
6 *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this Act
7 shall be available for the construction of any such building
8 on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*,
9 That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are
10 herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil
11 Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the
12 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,
13 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment
14 stored therein for distribution to projects under the super-
15 vision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and
16 distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such
17 supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (in-
18 cluding the cost of transportation and handling) to be reim-
19 bursed to appropriations current at the time additional
20 supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the
21 appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such
22 supplies, materials, or equipment (62)~~: *Provided further,*~~
23 ~~That in any case in which a State has established a central~~
24 ~~State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the~~
25 ~~United States or any of its agencies on policies and general~~

1 ~~programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal~~
2 ~~aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agree-~~
3 ~~ments made by or on behalf of the United States with any~~
4 ~~such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval~~
5 ~~of such central State agency before they shall become effec-~~
6 ~~tive as to such district~~, as follows:

7 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
8 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects
9 of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil
10 and moisture conservation (including the construction and
11 hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage); and
12 for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental
13 watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations,
14 $1,225,000.

15 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preven-
16 tive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such
17 special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and
18 the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of
19 farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and
20 operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation
21 plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
22 $28,340,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appro-
23 priation may be expended for soil and water con-
24 servation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided*
25 *further,* That any part of this appropriation allocated for

1 the production or procurement of nursery stock by any
2 Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency
3 for allocation to cooperating States for the production or
4 procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for
5 expenditure for not more than three fiscal years.

6 Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For
7 research and demonstration work in soil conservation
8 control measures, including research and demonstration work
9 in fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate
10 fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $72,248:
11 *Provided,* That no expenditures shall be made for these pur-
12 poses until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall
13 have been made available by the State of Florida, or a
14 political subdivision thereof, for the same purposes.

15 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF
16 SUBMARGINAL LAND

17 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
18 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
19 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), including the em-
20 ployment of persons and means in the District of Columbia
21 and elsewhere, $1,250,000.

22 (63) *EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF*
23 *AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES*

24 *To enable the Secretary to further carry out the provi-*
25 *sions of section 32, as amended, of the Act entitled "An Act*

1 *to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other*
2 *purposes", approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all*
3 *provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appro-*
4 *priated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June*
5 *30, 1945, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of*
6 *section 32 of said Act shall be available to the Secretary for*
7 *the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch*
8 *program under clause (2) of said section 32 in a sum not*
9 *exceeding $50,000,000: Provided, That such funds shall*
10 *be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1945*
11 *without regard to the requirement therein relating to the*
12 *encouragement of domestic consumption but no part of such*
13 *funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity*
14 *heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration.*

15 SUGAR ACT

16 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions,
17 other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands,
18 of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as
19 amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including the employ-
20 ment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and
21 elsewhere, as authorized by said Act, $52,510,203, to remain
22 available until June 30, 1946.

23 MARKETING SERVICE

24 For the employment of such persons and means in the
25 city of Washington and elsewhere (including not to exceed

1 $1,408,617 for departmental personal services in the Dis-
2 trict of Columbia) as may be necessary in conducting in-
3 vestigations, experiments, and demonstrations, either inde-
4 pendently or in cooperation with public or private agencies,
5 organizations, or individuals, as follows:

6 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
7 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely infor-
8 mation on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
9 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
10 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
11 and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and
12 their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and
13 other agricultural products, independently and in coopera-
14 tion with other branches of the Government, State agencies,
15 purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons en-
16 gaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and dis-
17 tribution of farm and food products. (64)~~$1,267,290~~ *$1,-*
18 *271,290.*

19 Market inspection of farm products: For enabling
20 the Secretary, independently and in cooperation with other
21 branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and
22 consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of com-
23 merce, or other associations of businessmen or trade organiza-
24 tions, and persons or corporations engaged in the production,
25 transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food

1 products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions,
2 to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested
3 parties the class, quality, and condition of cotton, tobacco,
4 fruits, and vegetables, whether raw, dried, canned, or other-
5 wise processed, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm
6 products when offered for interstate shipment or when re-
7 ceived at such important central markets as the Secretary may
8 from time to time designate, or at points which may be con-
9 veniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations
10 as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be
11 reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for
12 the service rendered: *Provided,* That officers and employees
13 who, under proper authorization, use privately owned motor
14 vehicles in the performance of official travel within the
15 corporate limits of their official stations for the purpose of
16 inspecting and grading farm and food products and the
17 supervision thereof at points located within the said cor-
18 porate limits may be reimbursed for such travel at a rate
19 not to exceed 3 cents per mile: *Provided further,* That
20 certificates issued by the authorized agents of the Depart-
21 ment shall be received in all courts of the United States
22 as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein
23 contained, $547,679.

24 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
25 among the people of the United States useful information

1 relative to the standardization, classification, grading, prep-
2 aration for market, handling, and marketing of farm and
3 food products, including the demonstration and promotion
4 of the use of uniform standards of classification of American
5 farm and food products throughout the world, and for making
6 analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7,
7 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), $451,500: *Provided,* That
8 samples, illustrations, practical forms, or sets of the grades
9 recommended or promulgated by the Secretary for farm or
10 food products may be sold under such rules and regulations
11 as he may prescribe, and the receipts therefrom deposited
12 in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

13 Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards
14 Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
15 visions of an Act entitled "An Act to establish and promote
16 the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide
17 and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for
18 other purposes", approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C.
19 511–511q), and an Act entitled "An Act to provide for
20 the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the
21 Department of Agriculture", approved January 14, 1929
22 (7 U. S. C. 501-508), as amended, $933,500.

23 Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency,
24 and Standard Container Acts: To enable the Secretary to
25 carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural

1 Commodities Act, approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7
2 U. S. C. 499a–499r), and the Act to prevent the
3 destruction or dumping of farm produce, and for other
4 purposes, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491–
5 497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916,
6 as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the Act to fix stand-
7 ards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets
8 for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes, approved
9 May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $210,000.

10 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts:
11 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of
12 the Act authorizing him to collect and publish statistics of
13 the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3,
14 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C.
15 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by
16 chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton
17 futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect
18 the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act,
19 approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65),
20 including such means as may be necessary for effectuating
21 agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and
22 other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the
23 adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton
24 classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes
25 with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution,

1 inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies
2 thereof under such agreements, $1,210,783.

3 United States Grain Standards Act: To enable the
4 Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United
5 States Grain Standards Act, $860,999.

6 United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary
7 to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Ware-
8 house Act, $533,930.

9 Federal Seed Act: To enable the Secretary to carry
10 into effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to
11 regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require
12 labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in inter-
13 state commerce; to require certain standards with respect to
14 certain imported seeds; and for other purposes", approved
15 August 9, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 1561–1610), $117,700: *Pro-*
16 *vided,* That not to exceed $250 of this amount may be used
17 for meeting the share of the United States in the expenses
18 of the International Seed Testing Congress in carrying out
19 plans for correlating the work of the various adhering gov-
20 ernments on problems relating to seed analysis or other
21 subjects which the Congress may determine to be necessary
22 in the interest of international seed trade.

23 Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the pro-
24 visions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August

1 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935
2 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $418,700.
3 Naval Stores Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry
4 into effect the provisions of the Naval Stores Act of March
5 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 91–99), $34,728.
6 Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry
7 into effect the provisions of the Act of April 26, 1910 (7
8 U. S. C. 121–134), entitled "An Act for preventing the
9 manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or mis-
10 branded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and
11 also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other
12 purposes", $215,208.
13 Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary to
14 carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange
15 Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), and as further
16 amended by the Act of October 9, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 2),
17 $348,797.
18 Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the
19 provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II
20 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C.
21 1291), $78,762.
22 (65) *LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION*
23 *To enable the Secretary through the War Food Admin-*
24 *istration to continue to provide assistance through rural re-*

1 *habilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States,*
2 *its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt*
3 *adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and*
4 *grants under this and prior laws, (2) loans to needy indi-*
5 *vidual farmers, (3) grants, and (4) liquidation as ex-*
6 *peditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects*
7 *under the supervision of the War Food Administration,*
8 *$28,265,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary*
9 *administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including*
10 *personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere;*
11 *not to exceed $57,000 for compensation of experts without*
12 *regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; pur-*
13 *chase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and news-*
14 *papers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-pro-*
15 *pelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding:*
16 *Provided, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit*
17 *to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to*
18 *the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under*
19 *his supervision, showing by name and by States all dis-*
20 *positions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with*
21 *the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of*
22 *liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.*
23 *In making any grant payments under this Act, the Sec-*
24 *retary is authorized to require with respect to such payments*
25 *the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal*

1 *and non-Federal, including work on private or public land*
2 *in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and*
3 *the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C.*
4 *796), as amended, relating to disability or death compen-*
5 *sation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing*
6 *such work: Provided, That this section shall not apply to any*
7 *case coming within the purview of the workmen's compen-*
8 *sation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which*
9 *the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar*
10 *benefits for injury or death.*

11 *For additional funds for the purpose of making rural*
12 *rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are*
13 *unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the*
14 *area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Recon-*
15 *struction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to*
16 *make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an*
17 *aggregate amount of not to exceed $96,710,000. Such ad-*
18 *vances shall be made (1) with interest at not to exceed the*
19 *rate of 3 per centum per annum payable semiannually; (2)*
20 *upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corpora-*
21 *tion heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursu-*
22 *ant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 per*
23 *centum of the then unpaid principal amount of the obliga-*
24 *tions securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms*

1 *and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation*
2 *may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corpora-*
3 *tion, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as*
4 *payments of principal and interest on the loans made from*
5 *the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations*
6 *held by the Corporaton as security for such advances, until*
7 *such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes de-*
8 *bentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corpora-*
9 *tion is authorized and empowered to issue and to have out-*
10 *standing at any one time under the provisions of law in force*
11 *on the date this Act takes effect is hereby increased by an*
12 *amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.*
13 *None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized*
14 *under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilita-*
15 *tion") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land*
16 *or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing*
17 *program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective*
18 *farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, pro-*
19 *motion or management of homestead associations, land-leas-*
20 *ing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative*
21 *land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant pur-*
22 *chasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible*
23 *of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making*
24 *of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or*
25 *(4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or*

1 *(5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the*
2 *purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative*
3 *association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services)*
4 *or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in*
5 *the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agri-*
6 *cultural commodities.*

7 *The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds admin-*
8 *istered by him as trustee under the various transfer agree-*
9 *ments with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations*
10 *only for purposes for which funds made available under this*
11 *caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to*
12 *such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such*
13 *trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.*

14 *The appropriation and authorizations herein made under*
15 *the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", shall*
16 *constitute the total amount to be available for obligation*
17 *under this heading during the fiscal year 1945 and shall*
18 *not be supplemented by funds from any source.*

19 *No part of the appropriation herein made under the*
20 *heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be*
21 *available to pay the compensation of any person appointed*
22 *in accordance with the civil-service laws.*

23 FARM TENANCY

24 To enable the Secretary through the War Food Admin-
25 istration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the

1 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
2 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:
3 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in con-
4 nection with the making of loans under title I of the
5 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937
6 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due
7 the United States on account of loans heretofore made under
8 the provisions of said Act, including the employment of
9 persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,
10 exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said
11 Act, (66)~~$750,000~~ *$1,500,000.*
12 Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance
13 with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,
14 approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006),
15 (67)~~$15,000,000~~ *$20,000,000*, which sum shall be borrowed
16 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest
17 rate of 3 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be
18 used for making loans under the terms of said Act for the pur-
19 chase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit
20 of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality
21 in which such purchase may be made, which value shall
22 be determined solely according to statistics of the farm
23 census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Cor-
24 poration is hereby authorized and directed to lend such
25 sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obliga-

1 tions of borrowers from the Secretary under the pro-
2 visions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
3 Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006):
4 *Provided,* That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction
5 Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the
6 principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting
7 the security therefor: *Provided further,* That the Secretary
8 may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest
9 on any loans made under such title I to repay the Recon-
10 struction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed there-
11 from under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further,*
12 That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such
13 obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation
14 is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding
15 at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by
16 an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

17 (68) *WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS*

18 *To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into*
19 *effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to promote*
20 *conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United*
21 *States by aiding in the development of facilities for water*
22 *storage and utilization, and for other purposes", approved*
23 *August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x,*
24 *590z–5), including the exchange, operation, and maintenance*
25 *of passenger-carrying vehicles, $1,025,000, of which not to*

exceed $11,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, (69)~~$2,550,000~~ *$2,750,000.*

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), (70)~~$20,000,000~~ *$40,000,000* (71), *which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction*

Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said Act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Administration in the District of Columbia and the field, including printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority attending meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $750 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic reporting services; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $10,000 for

1 purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by
2 personal service without regard to the provisions of any
3 other Act; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation
4 of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in the District
5 of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of
6 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-
7 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
8 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
9 without other compensation from the United States, in an
10 advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except
11 that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; not to ex-
12 ceed $10,000 for employment of persons, firms, and others for
13 the performance of special services, including legal services;
14 necessary administrative expenses in connection with the
15 making of loans under the provisions of the Act of January
16 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), and the collec-
17 tion of moneys due the United States on account of loans
18 made under the provisions of said Act and similar Acts
19 administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating
20 to loans for crop production, feed, seed, and harvesting;
21 examination of corporations, banks, associations, and in-
22 stitutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm
23 Credit Administration: *Provided,* That hereafter the ex-
24 penses and salaries of employees engaged in such exam-
25 inations shall be assessed against the said corporations,

1 banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of
2 existing laws except that the amounts collected from the
3 Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal in-
4 termediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916,
5 as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the
6 Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administra-
7 tion shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administra-
8 tion of the administrative supervision of the Federal land
9 banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate
10 credit banks, and the production credit corporations for
11 each fiscal year and shall apportion the amount so
12 determined among such banks and corporations on such equi-
13 table basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall
14 assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks
15 and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered
16 into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which
17 fund is hereby made available to said Administration for
18 expenditure for the purposes set forth in its annual
19 appropriation: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable
20 after June 30 of each fiscal year said Administration
21 shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the
22 cost of the examination services rendered during such
23 fiscal year to each Federal land bank, joint stock
24 land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2)
25 the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated

1 to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal in-
2 termediate credit bank, and production credit corporation
3 as the cost during such fiscal year of their administrative
4 supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case
5 is greater than the total amount collected from the bank
6 or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be
7 collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be
8 refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation
9 entitled thereto; in all, $626,321, together with not to ex-
10 ceed $4,459,480 from the funds made available to the
11 Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the Act of January
12 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o).
13 Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans: For
14 loans to farmers under the Act of January 29, 1937 (12
15 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), as amended by the Acts of
16 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
17 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
18 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
19 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), the un-
20 obligated balance (exclusive of the amount of such balance
21 made available for "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Ad-
22 ministration, 1945") of the appropriation "Crop production
23 and harvesting loans" as made in the First Deficiency Ap-
24 propriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (Act of February 9, 1937,
25 Public Law 4), and as continued available by the Acts of

1 February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939
2 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1),
3 July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public
4 Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), is
5 hereby made available, together with all collections of prin-
6 cipal and interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made
7 under said Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–
8 1020n, 1020o).

9 FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

10 Not to exceed $8,200,000 of the funds of the Federal
11 Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the Act of
12 January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h), shall be
13 available during the fiscal year 1945 for administrative
14 expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in
15 the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses of
16 officers and employees of the Corporation, in accordance
17 with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and
18 the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833);
19 printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, and not
20 to exceed $250 for periodicals and newspapers; contract
21 stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies,
22 equipment, and services; purchase, maintenance, repair, and
23 operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to
24 be used only for official purposes; rent in the District of
25 Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other neces-

1 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
2 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
3 without other compensation from the United States, in an
4 advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a con-
5 tract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the
6 performance of special services, including legal services; use
7 of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national
8 farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies
9 of the Government as authorized by said Act of January
10 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
11 *Provided*, That all expenditures which under the accounting
12 system prescribed for the Corporation by the General
13 Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments,
14 increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real
15 estate and chattel), shall be considered as nonadministrative
16 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That
17 except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified,
18 and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the admin-
19 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation
20 shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the
21 provisions of said Act of January 31, 1934, as amended
22 (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

23 GENERAL PROVISIONS

24 SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this
25 Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to

1 pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee
2 of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office,
3 agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation,
4 institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or
5 approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or em-
6 ployee of the Department or of any such bureau, office,
7 agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to
8 make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the pro-
9 visions of food production financing bulletins F–1 or F–2,
10 issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under
11 the Food Production Administration, Production Loans
12 Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the
13 applicant represents in writing and it is administratively
14 determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the
15 production of the crops or livestock specified in the appli-
16 cation is not available to him from sources other than the
17 Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from
18 other sources only on such terms and conditions that he
19 could not use the other credit available to the extent neces-
20 sary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or live-
21 stock specified in his application and (b) the person author-
22 ized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional
23 Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity
24 of the crops or livestock specified in the application would
25 be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than

1 sary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of
2 subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes,
3 without other compensation from the United States, in an
4 advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a con-
5 tract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the
6 performance of special services, including legal services; use
7 of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national
8 farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies
9 of the Government as authorized by said Act of January
10 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses:
11 *Provided,* That all expenditures which under the accounting
12 system prescribed for the Corporation by the General
13 Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments,
14 increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real
15 estate and chattel), shall be considered as nonadministrative
16 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That
17 except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified,
18 and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the admin-
19 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation
20 shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the
21 provisions of said Act of January 31, 1934, as amended
22 (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

23 GENERAL PROVISIONS

24 SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this
25 Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to

1 pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee
2 of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office,
3 agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation,
4 institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or
5 approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or em-
6 ployee of the Department or of any such bureau, office,
7 agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to
8 make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the pro-
9 visions of food production financing bulletins F–1 or F–2,
10 issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under
11 the Food Production Administration, Production Loans
12 Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the
13 applicant represents in writing and it is administratively
14 determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the
15 production of the crops or livestock specified in the appli-
16 cation is not available to him from sources other than the
17 Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from
18 other sources only on such terms and conditions that he
19 could not use the other credit available to the extent neces-
20 sary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or live-
21 stock specified in his application and (b) the person author-
22 ized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional
23 Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity
24 of the crops or livestock specified in the application would
25 be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than

1 would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance
2 under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency
3 Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148),
4 as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins
5 F–1 and F–2 made or approved on the conditions specified
6 in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or
7 advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of
8 the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within
9 one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region
10 which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated
11 as a region in which the making of such loans or advances
12 is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or
13 livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such
14 region: *Provided,* That none of the limitations provided for
15 by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance
16 made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing
17 the completion of production undertaken before July 12,
18 1943, or for the purpose of protecting or preserving
19 the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of
20 any loan or advance made or approved before such date.

21 SEC. 3. Not to exceed 7 per centum of the foregoing
22 amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any
23 bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be
24 available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects
25 included within the general expenses of such bureau,

1 division, or office, but no more than 7 per centum shall be
2 added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of
3 extraordinary emergency.

4 SEC. 4. During the fiscal year for which appropriations
5 are herein made the head of any department or independent
6 establishment of the Government requiring inspections,
7 analyses, and tests of food and other products, within the
8 scope of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and
9 which that Department is unable to perform within the limits
10 of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary,
11 transfer to the Department for direct expenditure such sums
12 as may be necessary for the performance of such work.

13 SEC. 5. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the
14 lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department
15 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and
16 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the
17 conduct of the field work of the Department outside the Dis-
18 trict of Columbia: *Provided,* That such vehicles shall be used
19 only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but
20 this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of
21 motortrucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,*
22 That appropriations contained in this Act shall be available
23 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled
24 and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided fur-*
25 *ther,* That the funds available to the Agricultural Adjust-

1 ment Agency may be used for the maintenance, repair, and
2 operation of one passenger-carrying vehicle in the District
3 of Columbia.

4 SEC. 6. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the
5 employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary
6 employment of translators when competent citizen trans-
7 lators are not available; (2) employment in cases of
8 emergency of persons in the field service of the Department
9 for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment
10 on the emergency rubber project; (4) employment by the
11 Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed twenty
12 junior engineer trainees who are citizens of other American
13 republics; and (5) employment under the appropriation for
14 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

15 SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this
16 Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person
17 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
18 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
19 States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the pur-
20 poses hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie
21 evidence that the person making the affidavit does not
22 advocate, and is not a member of an organization that
23 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
24 States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That such
25 administrative or supervisory employees of the Department

1 as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary
2 are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons
3 making affidavits required by this section, and they shall
4 charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any
5 person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization
6 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
7 United States by force or violence and accepts employment
8 the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropria-
9 tion contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,
10 upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or
11 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
12 *further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition
13 to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of exist-
14 ing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section
15 shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person
16 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency
17 work involving the loss of human life or destruction of
18 property, and payment of salary or wages may be made
19 to such persons from applicable appropriations for services
20 rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit
21 contemplated by this section.

22 SEC. 8. If at any time during the fiscal year 1945 the
23 termination of the Act entitled "An Act to provide temporary
24 additional compensation for employees in the Postal Serv-

1 ice", approved April 9, 1943, or of the Act entitled "An
2 Act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation
3 to Government employees, and for other purposes", ap-
4 proved May 7, 1943, shall be fixed by concurrent resolution
5 of the Congress at a date earlier than June 30, 1945, the
6 appropriations contained in this Act shall cease to be avail-
7 able on such earlier date for obligation for the purposes of
8 the terminated Act and the unobligated portions of appro-
9 priations allocated for the purposes of such terminated Act
10 shall not be obligated for any other purposes of the appro-
11 priation during the fiscal year 1945.

12 SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Department of
13 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945".

Passed the House of Representatives March 24, 1944.

Attest: SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments May 17 (legislative day, May 9), 1944.

Attest: EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary.

78TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4443

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 17, 1944

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE 78th-2nd, No. 89
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued May 19, 1944, for actions of May 18, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

gricultural appropria-
ion bill (individual
tems not indexed).....1
ppropriations....1,11,14
laims.....11
airy industry.....4
conomy.....8
rm Security.....1,2
ood control.....10
ood damage.....20
od adm. (general)....12
Food distribution.....1
1,2,4,5,27
Food processing.....17
Foor production.....16
Foreign relief.....13
Labor, farm.....8,29
Land acquisition's.....19
Lend-lease.....18
Loans, farm.....3,21,23
Machinery, farm.....17
Milk waste.....4
Organic Act of 1944.....2
Price control.....22,25
Priorities.....28
Property disposition...15
Public debt.....6,15
Puerto Rico.....9
Rationing.....26
Surplus property.....6,15
Taxation.....16
Transportation.....4,7,24
Veterans.....3,21

HOUSE

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Reps. Tarver, Cannon, Sheppard, Wene, Lambertson, Dirksen, and Plumley were appointed conferees on this bill, H.R. 4443. Reps. Tarver, Cochran, and others discussed the school-lunch and FSA amendments to this and the Pace bill (p. 4719.)

ORGANIC ACT OF 1944. Received the conference report on this bill H.R. 4278 (pp. 4763-4). For provisions of the conference report see Digest 88.

FARM LOANS; VETERANS. Passed, 387-0, with amendments S. 1767, the GI Bill of Rights (pp. 4721-63). Agreed to Rep. Andresen's (Minn.) amendment to increase the guaranteed loan figure from $1500 to $2500 so that veterans "can acquire a farm which will provide a living as well as a full-time occupation" (p. 4749). Rejected amendments by Rep. Flannagan, Va., to "restore the Senate version of section 502 covering loans to be used in purchasing land, building, livestock," etc. (pp. 4734-43); by Rep. Murray, Wis., to limit interest rates to those prevailing for comparable loans in Federal loan agencies (pp. 4743-5); and Rep. Johnson, Okla., reduce the interest rate from 6 to 4 percent (pp. 4746-7).

MILK WASTE. Rep. Gillie, Ind., criticized the destruction of 1000 gallons of milk while there are people starving to death (p. 4720).

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM. Rep. Sullivan, Nev., commended the school-lunch provision in H.R. 4278, the Organic Act of 1944 (p. 4720).

SURPLUS PROPERTY. Rep. Herter, Mass., urging that the proceeds of sale or disposition of surplus property "be applied exclusively to the liquidation" of the war debt (p. 4720).

7. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Cochran, Mo., criticized H.R. 4184, to amend the Transportation Act of 1940 so as to eliminate the provision authorizing the transportation of military and naval personnel and property on land-grant railroads, at half rates (p. 4718).

8. FARM LABOR; ECONOMY. Rep. Phillips, Calif., criticized the waste in Government publications and cited an example of WMC material, received by a Calif. canner and food processor, on the employment of labor at processing plants where wages "are frozen at lower figures than are the wages at adjacent war industries" (pp. 4766-7).

9. PUERTO RICO. Insular Affairs Committee submitted a second interim report pursuant to H.Res. 159, providing for an investigation of political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico (H. Rept. 1467) (p. 4770).

10. FLOOD CONTROL. Received a War Department report on the Leaf and Bowie Rivers and their tributaries (Miss.). To Flood Control Committee. (p. 4770.)

11. APPROPRIATIONS; CLAIMS. Received from the President an appropriation estimate of $5,480,286.09 to cover claims allowed by GAO for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (H. Doc. 610). To Appropriations Committee. (p. 4770.)

12. FOOD ADMINISTRATION. Rep. Rees, Kans., spoke urging "a single responsible agency" to handle the food problem (p. 4769).

13. FOREIGN RELIEF. Rep. Woodruff, Mich., urged that the American people be not "misled by the false philosophy that we can feed the world on credit and that nobody will ever have to pay the bill" (pp. 4767-8).

SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Fri., May 19.

14. LEGISLATIVE-JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945. Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H.R. 4414 (S. Rept. 888) (May 17) (p. 4652).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. PROPERTY DISPOSITION; PUBLIC DEBT. By Rep. Herter, Mass., H.R. 4822, to provide that all sums received by the U.S. from the liquidation of Government property be applied to the reduction of the public debt. To Ways and Means Committee. (p. 4771.)

16. CROP LOSSES; TAXATION. By Rep. Burdick, N. Dak., H.R. 4823, relating to crop losses in computing net income for the purposes of the income tax. To Ways and Means Committee. (p. 4771.)

17. FARM AND FOOD PROCESSING EQUIPMENT. By Rep. Johnson, Ill., H.Res. 554, authorizing a study and investigation of the Iron and Steel Price Branch of OPA. To Rules Committee. (p. 4771.)

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

18. LEND-LEASE. H.R. 4254, to continue the Lend-Lease Act for 1 year with provisions limiting settlement powers. Approved May 17, 1944 (Public Law 304, 78th Cong.)

REHABILITATION OF DISABLED SOLDIERS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the Army was doing everything that science and talent and money could accomplish in rehabilitating our soldiers who had or might lose legs or arms, partly or wholly, I called the military subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations together last December 17, and had the Surgeon General of the Army, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, come before us and tell us what had been done, what was being done, and what was in contemplation to be done, and what, if anything more, the Congress might do.

Fortunately, the present Surgeon General of the Army probably has no peer in the field of prosthetics.

At that hearing I invited our beloved colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN, to be present. Having lost both of his legs he can appreciate the suffering and later handicaps of others who may be so unfortunate as to lose a limb or limbs. During the course of the hearing the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] suggested the preparation of a handbook that would be a help and guide to soldiers so afflicted. I have here a small illustrated pamphlet entitled "Helpful Hints to Those Who Have Lost Limbs," which has been prepared by the War Department in pursuance of our colleague's suggestion. I feel that the House should have this information.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by the Honorable HARRY P. JEFFREY, of Ohio, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on May 16, 1944, on the G. I. bill of rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the remarks I made before the House by inadvertence or mistake of the messenger were not returned in time to get into the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that those remarks be carried in the RECORD of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from from Georgia?

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did not the Senate add to this bill an amendment providing an appropriation to carry on the program commonly known as the school-lunch program?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. I sincerely hope the gentleman from Georgia will give the House an opportunity to vote on that amendment.

Mr. TARVER. The amendment is legislative in character and under the rules of the House may not be included in the conference report but will be brought back to the House, unless the Senate recedes, for a separate House vote.

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope the gentleman will not try to get the Senate to recede, because that is one program that not only helps the farmer but helps our constituents in the cities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I state that it is my understanding that a conference report either has been or will be filed on the legislative bill authorizing the continuance of the school-lunch program for a period of 2 years.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that it will then be possible to ascertain the sentiment of the House with regard to whether or not this program should be continued. The subcommittee on which I serve as chairman and the Senate conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill last year took the position that the school-lunch program was not to be continued unless legislatively authorized, so I think that the action of the conferees should be largely determined by the decision of the question arising on the Pace bill as to whether or not the Congress proposes to authorize legislatively the making of the appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted to advise my friend that a conference report either has been or will be filed on the authorization bill that passed the House and the Senate and has been in conference and which provides, as I understand, for the extension of the school-lunch program for 2 years and also the F. S. A. for 1 year.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will support that Senate amendment, but that is an authorization. The amendment I referred to is an appropriation.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not expect to object, also in this bill coming from the Senate is about $96,000,000 for the Farm Security Administration, for which there has never been any authorization, and which we distinctly left out of the bill as it left the House because there was no authority for it, on the promise, I took it, that the House Committee on Agriculture was going to bring in a bill authorizing the Farm Security Administration. I understand the conference report on the Pace bill has been agreed to for a couple of days but it has not even been submitted to the House as a report. Are we going to have to do this unexpected thing of passing on an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration when it has not been authorized, after all the hub-bub of a year ago?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman realizes, of course, that appropriations for Farm Security purposes were not considered by our subcommittee by reason of the fact that they have not been legislatively authorized. The situation is the same or practically the same in reference to the Farm Security Administration item as placed in the bill by the Senate as it is with reference to the school-lunch program. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and under the rules of the House, if the Senate does not recede from the item, it will be necessary for the House conferees to bring it back to the House for a separate vote in this body, when the will of our colleagues may be ascertained.

Mr. DONDERO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia whether or not the proposal is for permanent school lunches or only for a temporary period?

Mr. TARVER. I have not had time to digest thoroughly the Senate amendments to this bill, but my understanding is that the proposal is for the school-lunch program to be carried on for the next fiscal year. I do not think the amendment to the appropriation bill goes beyond that, but as far as the legislative bill is concerned, known as the Pace bill, I understand that the proposed authorization is for 2 years.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia if in the Farm Security Administration appropriation sufficient money is available for employees, so that we shall not have the situation that obtained last year, of having five $700 loans per employee, in other words, having one employee for every $3,500 that is loaned in order to help produce food to win the war.

Mr. TARVER. As I said a few moments ago, I have not had time to digest thoroughly the Senate amendments. I do not know the verbiage which they contain. The gentleman may rest assured that our subcommittee will give the matter very careful and thorough consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. TARVER, CANNON of Missouri, SHEPPARD, WENE, LAMBERTSON, DIRKSEN, and PLUMLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Fort Wayne News Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

WASTE OF MILK

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, my friends in the House know, I believe, that I am not frequently moved by an almost uncontrollable rage, but I can find no other words to express my reaction, as an ordinary citizen and as a former food inspector in Indiana, to two pictures I am sure you all notice in yesterday's Washington Daily News. The pictures I refer to are the ones showing the emaciated body of a child, fallen dead in the street from starvation, and the picture beside it of two men pouring 1,000 gallons of milk down the drain in Atlanta, Ga.

What can be the reaction of the people of this country—and particularly those who are toiling under difficult conditions to fill the food-production goals they have been called to meet—when they learn of such outrageous waste brought about by Government red tape and regulations. Surely anyone with common, ordinary, unadulterated horse sense could have found a way to use this milk. Why did it not go to some of our poor school children? Why did it not go to a milk-drying plant? Why did it not go to a condensery? Why, during this period of feed shortages, did it not go to feeding our chickens or hogs?

The cut line under the pictures said that the milk was being destroyed because orders of the Office of Defense Transportation forbade Sunday delivery, and it stated further that this 1-day milk ration would have provided a quart of milk a day for 4,000 hungry children. I tell you, gentlemen, I have demanded an immediate explanation of this outrage—not because there can be any satisfactory explanation of this horrible occurrence, but because we must have assurances that this stupidity will not be repeated and that steps are taken which will guarantee that this unbelievably scandalous procedure will not occur again.

TO EARMARK PROCEEDS OF SALE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY AND REQUIRE APPLICATION OF FUNDS TO DEBT RETIREMENT

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the liquidation of surplus property owned by the Government of the United States is already beginning. This surplus property represents a portion of the capital wealth of the Nation. Under existing law, the proceeds of the sale of this property will be coming into the Treasury as current income and will be spent as current income, even though the greater part of the property was acquired through borrowing from the American people. Under any honest system of bookkeeping, the proceeds from the sale of this property should be applied exclusively to the liquidation of the debt which has been incurred during the war period. Acting with the approval of the Republican Tax Study Committee, of which I am a member, I have today filed a bill requiring the Government to follow this policy.

In the Baruch report of February 15 there appears the following statement:

> All of the war surpluses will have been paid for by the American public either through war taxes or the increase in the national debt. Therefore, the proceeds of all sales should go to reduce that debt, lowering the post-war carrying charges which will have to be met through taxation. Certainly no agency should be permitted to sell surpluses and use the proceeds for other purposes.
>
> The fact that surplus sales will lower the debt dramatizes an important point which some business groups are inclined to forget. The net result of an effective disposal program will aid all business, which is an important consideration to be balanced against the possible short-term effects of individual sales.

The text of my bill is very brief, and I therefore quote it in full herein:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That all sums received by any department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, for the liquidation of Government property shall be covered and deposited in the Treasury to the credit of a special fund, which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt, and which shall not be considered in any manner as current income of the Government.

I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will give consideration to this bill at the earliest possible moment. As I stated above, surplus property is already being disposed of and the proceeds already flowing into the Treasury. Prompt enactment of this bill is highly desirable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the school-lunch program—embodied in H. R. 4278, and other proposals—strikes me as worthy of continued support by the Federal Government for the immediate future. I believe that with time and trial it will so appeal to the States that it will ultimately be sponsored entirely by them with beneficial results far exceeding the financial outlay required. When this matter was before the House a few weeks ago, I supported and voted for the school-lunch program, and I see no reason to change my position now. Although the program was defeated in the House, I hope we will have another opportunity to vote on it, as the Senate yesterday restored this item to the bill.

At base, the program makes for better citizens in whom a healthy body will provide that sound mentality and character on which the progress of our Nation depends. A nation, like any other entity, is a whole dependent on the sum of its parts. We are constantly concerned with all crops in respect of their quality as well as quantity. Our natural resources are not sufficient alone.

The program is not for the destitute alone. Lunches are furnished free only for about one-tenth of the school children. They are furnished practically at cost for the remainder. The highest type of lunch costs 9 cents for food, the labor being furnished locally. But it is the expert knowledge employed in finding proper foods having nutrition value, coupled with proper variety and balance, that enables the schools to function upon growing minds with the highest efficiency.

It is not too much to say that the educational effort and the economic control expended for making a rugged citizenry will be largely wasted on ill-fed children.

After this war we shall doubtless maintain an enlarged standing army in service as well as a potential army fitted for the economic and military emergencies that will cast their shadows over the world. I believe that problem can be half solved if we make sure that each child in his formative school years is assured of receiving at least one sufficient, properly chosen and regularly administered meal every day of his life and forming, as one might say, a necessary part of the curriculum of his education. If the family is to survive as an effective unit of society, the aggregate knowledge and resources of the entire Nation must assist.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by me on last Sunday at the annual communion breakfast of the Sixty-ninth Regiment in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE 78th-2nd, No. 103
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued June 7, 1944, for actions of Monday, June 6, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

gricultural appropri-
ation bill (individual
items not indexed.....1
ppropriations.....1,2,3
ommodity loans.....9
otton.....11
airy dindustry.....12
ebt limit.....8
Farm Credit.....16
Food distribution...10,13
Food production.....12
Forestry.....14
Loans, farm.....16
Narcotics.....4
Personnel.....5
Price control.....7,12
Puerto Rico.....10
Research.....4
Social security.....15
Sugar.....10,13
Taxation.....8
Transportation.....6

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the conference report on this bill, H.R. 4443 (pp. 5507-10). The report provides as follows: Solicitor's Office, $1,930,632 (House figure, $1,830,632). BAE economic investigations, $2,375,236 (House, $2,325,236; Senate $2,475,236). BPISAE: limits cost of buildings to $2,500 and cost of alterations to any one building to $500 or 2% of building cost, whichever is greater but in no event to exceed $2,500; agricultural engineering investigations, (1) mechanization of sugar-beet agriculture, $20,000 (Senate figure), (2) improvement of labor-saving machinery for sugar-cane production, $40,000 (Senate $65,000), and (3) retains the Senate provision providing $10,000 for construction of a building at Houma, La.; accepts the Senate proposal restoring the Budget estimate, for cereal crops and diseases, of $4,778 to permit continuation of cereal-improvement work at Dickinson, N. Dak., and restoring the decrease of $150 at Tucumcari, N. Mex.; dry-land agriculture, accepts the Senate proposal restoring the Budget reduction of $10,163 for continuance of Lawton (Okla.) station and restoring $2,400 to permit continuance of cooperative work at Moro, Oreg.; fruit and vegetable crops and diseases, $5,000 (Senate figure) for practical control methods for azalea flower-spot disease; plant exploration, etc., $8,913 for Savannah (Ga.) station; soil surveys, $162,582 (House figure); and Tobacco investigations, $143,520 (Senate figure) for N. C. burley tobacco work. Strikes out the Senate provision making $11,300 available for BE&PQ/citrus canker eradication work in foreign parasites, $25,000 (House, $20,000; Senate $30,000). Limits cost of BA&IC buildings to $7,500 and cost of alterations to 2% or $500 whichever is greater but in no event to exceed $2,500. Forest management, $17,500 (House $10,000; Senate $25,000). Range investigations, $288,475 (House figure; Senate $323,475). Forest products, $1,147,519 (Senate figure; House, $1,092,519). Forest economics, $84,018 (Senate figure; House $74,018). Forest fire cooperation, $6,300,000 (Senate figure; House, $2,529,062) strikes out the Senate provision making $10,000 available for studies of the

effect of tax laws and timber insurance, and accepts the Senate provision authorizing expenditure of $1,000,000 on critical areas of national importance, without matching, amended so as to require that the areas in question must be extremely critical. Emergency rubber project, $3,020,985 (Senate figure; House, $3,952,585). WFA, $30,700,000 (Senate figure; House, $29,200,000) for wage stabilization where a "majority" of the producers request the intervention, CCC salaries and expenses, $7,208,526 (Senate figure; House, $5,458,526) for the dairy-production payment program, estimated to cost $400,000,000 although the conferees stated that the allowance "shall not be construed as approving any subsidy program now in effect or hereafter promulgated by this agency." Sale of deteriorated fruits and vegetables by CCC below parity permitted. Agricultural program payments under conservation and use, $290,000,000(House figure and language. Conservation and use, salaries and expenses, $24,250,000 (House figure; Senate, $25,000,000), and retains the House language limiting amount that can be transferred to the appropriation account, "Agricultural Adjustment Agency." Restores House language requiring the approval of State AAA committees of the farming practices to be prescribed for the 1945 agricultural program. Retains the Senate provision making the appropriation available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or soil-terracing services as grants in aid to agricultural producers, but "The inclusion of the Senate provision for 1946 is not to be construed as a comittal to the agricultural program for 1946." FCIC, reappropriates $350,000 (House, $100,000; Senate, $420,000) for continuance of liquidation during 1945 and prohibits the writing of any insurance on crops planted subsequest to July 31, 1943. Restores the House language amended so as to limit to Mo. the provision that agreements between the U.S. and State soil conservation districts shall have the prior approval of the central State agency established for that purpose. Marketing service, $1,271,290 (Senate figure; House, $1,267,290). Farm tenancy, $15,000,000 of RFC funds (House figure; Senate $20,000,000). Water facilities, $1,025,000 (Senate figure). REA salaries and expenses, $2,550,000 (House figure; Senate, $2,750,000). REA loans, $25,000,000 (House, $20,000,000; Senate, $40,000,000).

The following items were reported in disagreement: Salaries of the Chief of BAE, Agricultural Research Administrator, and the Chief of the Forest Service (the House conferees will move to recede and concur). The Senate amendment providing $996,821 in excess of the House figure to cover cost of reclassifying veterinarians (the House conferees will move to insist). Senate amendment authorizing not to exceed $10,000 of the appropriation for construction of a machine shop and laboratory at Houma, La. (the House conferees will move to recede and concur). Barberry eradication (House, $258,470; Senate, $283,470) (the House conferees will move to insist). BA&IC, cost of buildings outside D. C.: House limited expenditure to $15,000; Senate amendment struck out House language and inserted a cost limitation on any one building to $7,500 and alteration limitation to 2% of cost of building or $500, whichever is greater (House conferees will propose substitute language similar to the Senate amendment with a limitation on the cost of alterations to $2,500). Forest fire cooperation, authorizes expenditur of $10,000,000 of the appropriation, without matching, for preventing or suppressing forest fires on "extremely" critical areas (the House conferees will m move to recede and concur). Emergency rubber project liquidation (House language; Senate struck it out) (the House conferees will to move to insist). WFA, Senate amendment provides not to exceed $20,000 for travel expenses to and from their homes of consultants employed intermittently away from their homes o a per diem basis when actually employed (the House conferees will move to reced and concur). Senate amendment requiting CCC, indetermining the parity price of 7/8 middling cotton, to use the same method as is used for determining such

parity price at the average location used in fixing the basic loan rate (the House conferees will move to recede and concur). Incentive payments, [illegible] $12,500,000 (Senate figure) for payments for harvesting seed of grasses and legumes (the House conferees will move to recede and concur). The House language prohibiting incentive payments except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments, etc. (the House conferees will move to recede and concur with an amendment to permit incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes). Senate amendment directing WFA to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops (the House conferees will move to recede and concur). AAA political activity provision (the House conferees will move to insist). School-lunch (the House conferees will move to recede and concur with amendment, striking out the Senate language and inserting in lieu thereof the pertinent language of the Senate amendment to the Pace bill as amended by the House on June 1. This will provide $50,000,000 from Sec. 32 funds but will omit the language authorizing further appropriations). FSA, administrative expenses and grants (the House conferees will move to recede and concur with amendments providing $26,000,000 for administrative expenses and grants and $67,500,000 of RFC funds for loans); (Senate, $28,265,000 for administrative expenses and grants and $96,710,000 of RFC funds for loans). Farm tenancy, $1,500,000 (Senate figure; House, $750,000) (the House conferees will move to recede and concur).

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H.R. 4204, and acted on items in disagreement (pp. 5510-20). Agreed to Rep. Rabaut's motion to insist on disagreement, after rejecting, 139-175, Rep. Rabaut's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing for a census of agriculture (pp. 5511-6).

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the conference report on this bill, H.R. 4183 (p. 5514). The items relating to increased production of agricultural commodities that would be promoted by the use of any irrigation or flood control project and appropriations (House $25,000,000; Senate, $26,000,000) for flood control on the Mississippi River were reported in disagreement.

NARCOTICS. Passed as reported H.R. 4881, to classify a new synthetic drug, "isonipecaine" (demerol) (pp. 5481-3).

PERSONNEL. Received CSC's proposed bill to establish a uniform policy with respect to the pay status of civilian employees suspended without pay pending investigation. To Civil Service Committee. (p. 5523)

TRANSPORTATION. Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4625, to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years (H. Rept. 1603) (p. 5523).

SENATE

PRICE CONTROL. Continued debate on S. 1764, to amend the Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts (pp. 5457-77). Agreed to the committee amendments, providing a new 60-day period after July 1, 1944, regarding protests against regulations issued before that date, with an amendment by Sen. Wagner, N. Y., providing that two judges shall constitute a quorum of the Court of Appeals and of each division thereof, after rejecting, 30-40, Sen. Danaher's, Conn., amendment to the committee amendment, which would advance the date by 30 days for allowing aggrieved persons who file protest as to outstanding orders or regulations to have a hearing before the board of review (pp. 5457-62). Agreed,

48-26, to the committee amendment with amendments by Sen. Wherry, Nebr., as modified by Sen. Ferguson's amendment to permit defendants in certain price contr proceedings to challange the regulations which they are charged with violatin (pp. 5462-8). Agreed to the committee amendment with an amendment, modifying the provisions for damage actions against sellers and landlords, and authorizing OPA to bring such actions if the person damaged does not (pp. 5468-77).

During the debate Sens. Brooks, Ill., and Thomas, Okla., submitted amendments which they intend to propose to this bill. Sen. Bankhead, Ala., announced that he had 2 or 3 amendments to add to the textile-cotton section of this bill, and Sen. Wagner, N. Y., inserted a National Congress of Parents and Teachers' letter favoring the so-called Bankhead amendment(p. 5477).

8. DEBT LIMIT. Senate agreed to conference report on H.R. 4464, to increase the debt limit of the U.S. to $260,000,000,000 and to reduce from 30% to 20% the cabaret taxes (p. 5457).

House agreed, 62-38, on a division vote, to the conference report; but the vote was vacated on objection of Rep. Shafer, Mich., because of the lack of a quorum(pp. 5520-3).

BILL INTRODUCED

9. COMMODITY LOANS. By Rep. Elliott, Calif., H.J.Res. 292, authorizing and directing the CCC to distribute certain money received by it in connection with its 1943 raisin variety grape purchase and resale program to increase production o raisins. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 5523.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. SUGAR INDUSTRY; PUERTO RICO. Resident Commissioner Pagan, P. R. inserted a Puerto Rico Farmers' Association resolution requesting aid for the sugar industry of P. R. (pp. A3039-40).

11. COTTTON. Sen. Thomas, Okla., inserted Tom Linder's (Ga. commissioner of agriculture) article, "Cotton," in which he urged increased cotton prices (pp. A3035-6).

12. HOG PRICES. Sen. Gillie, Ind., inserted resolutions of "local representatives" of this Department and WFA charging Federal "evasion of hog marketing regulations" and "price discrimination against Northeastern Indiana hogs" (pp. A3031 A3035).

13. SUGAR ACT EXTENSION. Speech in the House by Rep. Hope, Kans., urging continuation of this Act (p. A3033).

14. FORESTRY. Sen Cordon, Oreg., inserted Pa. Gov. Snell's Governors' Conference address urging "Conservation of Our Timber Resources" (pp. A3031-2).

15. SOCIAL SECURITY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Ramey, Ohio, urging support of H.R. 1649, the so-called Townsend National Recovery plan bill, which includes social security benefits for farmers and farm workers (pp. A3025-6).

16. FARM CREDIT. Extension of remarks of Rep. Poage, Tex., favoring H.Res. 525, authorizing the Cooley committee to make an investigation of FCA (p. A3029).

- o -

Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Anton J.
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Luther A.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kelley
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Kinzer
Kleberg
Knutson
Kunkel
LaFollette
Lambertson
Lane
Lanham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lesinski
Luce
Ludlow
Lynch
McConnell
McCormack
McCowen
McGehee
McGregor
McKenzie
McLean
McMillan
McWilliams
Maas
Madden
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Mansfield, Tex.
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merritt
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Mills
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Morrison, La.
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Norman
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neal
Outland
Patton
Pfeifer
Phillips
Pittenger
Ploeser
Poage
Poulson
Powers
Pracht,
C. Frederick
Pratt,
Joseph M.
Price
Rabaut
Ramey
Randolph
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Richards
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowe
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Satterfield
Sauthoff
Schwabe
Scrivner
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Somers, N. Y.
Spence
Springer
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sullivan
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tarver
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolan
Towe
Troutman
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walter
Ward
Wasielewski
Weaver
Welch
Wene
West
Wheichel, Ga.
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Willey
Wilson
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—35

Barden
Bonner
Bradley, Pa.
Bulwinkle
Burgin
Cannon, Fla.
Celler
Clark
Cochran
Cooley
Durham
Eberharter
Ellison, Md.
Flannagan
Folger
Ford
Fulmer
Gathings
Gore
Hobbs
Holifield
Izac
Jarman
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Kefauver
Kirwan
Marcantonio
Murphy
Norton
O'Toole
Pace
Snyder
Torrens
Weiss
Wright

NOT VOTING—88

Abernethy
Anderson, N. Mex.
Baldwin, Md.
Barry
Boren
Boykin
Brooks
Burchill, N. Y.
Burdick
Capozzoli
Chapman
Clason
Costello
Cox
Delaney
Dewey
Dickstein
Dies
Douglas
Ellis
Fenton
Fernandez
Fulbright
Fuller
Furlong
Gallagher
Gibson
Gilchrist
Granger
Grant, Ind.
Green
Halleck
Hare
Hart
Hays
Heffernan
Heidinger
Hess
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Ward
Kennedy
Keogh
King
Klein
Landis
Larcade
Lea
Lemke
Lewis
McCord
McMurray
Magnuson
Martin, Iowa
May
Merrow
Miller, Mo.
Morrison, N. C.
Myers
Newsome
O'Connor
Patman
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Philbin
Plumley
Priest
Ramspeck
Rowan
Russell
Scanlon
Schiffler
Scott
Sheridan
Sikes
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, W. Va.
Sparkman
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Stearns, N. H.
Stewart
Stigler
Taylor
Treadway
Weichel, Ohio
White
Whitten
Winstead

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Keogh, with Mr. Miller of Missouri.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. King with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Schiffler.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Rowan with Miss Stanley.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Ellis.
Mr. May with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Burdick.

Messrs. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania and MURPHY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber when my name was called on the last roll call. I voted on the motion to recommit and went back to a committee. I have hurried all the way back, but I was not in the Chamber when my name was called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 133 and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (1) effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, that operate to prevent the court martial or prosecution of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, are hereby extended for a further period of 1 year, in addition to the extension provided for in Public Law 208, Seventy-eighth Congress.

(2) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are severally directed to proceed forthwith with an investigation into the facts surrounding the catastrophe described in (1) above, and thereafter in their discretion to commence such proceedings against such persons as the facts may justify.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer as an amendment the House joint resolution just passed by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, that operate to prevent the court martial or prosecution of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, are hereby extended for a further period of 3 months, in addition to the extension provided for in Public Law 208, Seventy-eighth Congress.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are severally directed to institute court-martial proceedings for any offense committed by any person, to whose court martial the extension of time provided for in section 1 hereof relates, as soon as possible, and in no event later than the period of extension provided for in section 1 hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 283) was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4443) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 24, 33, 37, 50, 51, 54, 55, 57, 67, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47, 56, 58, 64, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,160,552"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,375,236"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided,* That the cost of erecting any one building, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$353,639"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$951,611"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$506,348"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$71,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a majority of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "(or in the case of perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further,* That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 27, 31, 40, 41, 43, 48, 52, 53, 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, and 71.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

CORRECTIONS OF TEXT, PUNCTUATION, ETC.

The following amendments are for clarification, or in correction of allocations the text, punctuation, and other technical corrections: Nos. 2, 3, 4, 8, 28, 29, 30, 39, and 56.

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 1, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,930,632 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,830,632 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 6, economic investigations: Appropriates $2,375,236, instead of $2,325,236 as proposed by the House and $2,475,236 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Amendment No. 15, cost of buildings: Limits the cost of buildings to $2,500 and the cost of alterations to any one building during the fiscal year 1945 to $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building, whichever is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17, agricultural engineering investigations: Appropriates $20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for mechanization of sugar-beet agriculture, and $40,000, instead of $65,000 as proposed by the Senate, for improvement of labor-saving machinery for sugar-cane production, and retains the Senate provision making $10,000 available for construction of a building at Houma, Louisiana.

Amendment No. 18, cereal crops and diseases: Accepts the Senate proposal restoring the Budget reduction of $4,778 to permit continuation of cereal improvement work at Dickinson, North Dakota, and restoring the decrease of $150 at Tucumcari, New Mexico.

Amendment No. 19, dry-land agriculture: Accepts the Senate proposal restoring the Budget reduction of $10,163 to permit continuance of the station at Lawton, Oklahoma, and restoring $2,400 to permit the continuance of cooperative work at Moro, Oregon.

Amendment No. 20, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: Appropriates $5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for continuation of work to develop practical control methods for azalea flower-spot disease.

Amendment No. 21, plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: Appropriates $8,913, as proposed by the Senate, for continuance of the station at Savannah, Georgia.

Amendment No. 22, soil surveys: Eliminates the Senate restoration of the House cut of $12,000.

Amendment No. 23, tobacco investigations: Appropriates $12,500, as proposed by the Senate, for work in North Carolina on burley tobacco.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 24, citrus canker eradication: Strikes out the Senate provision making an appropriation of $11,300.

Amendment No. 26, foreign parasites: Reduces to $5,000 the Senate increase of $10,000. The Senate report indicates the increase is for work on the Klamath weed. By agreement of the conferees of both Houses, the Department will have discretion in the application of the fund.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Amendment No. 27, cost of buildings: Limits the cost of buildings to $7,500 and the cost of alterations to any one building during the fiscal year 1945 to $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building, whichever is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 32, forest management: The House bill provided $10,000 for work in connection with the control of the spruce budworm. The Senate proposed an increase of $15,000 over the House figure. The conference report retains $7,500 of the Senate increase.

Amendment No. 33, range investigations: Strikes out the Senate increase of $35,000, of which $10,000 was for research in converting cut-over Douglas fir lands to grazing and $25,000 was for study of livestock and big game grazing in the Intermountain region.

Amendment No. 34, forest products: Retains the Senate increase of $55,000, of which $20,000 is an increase over the House item of $15,000 for studies of the utilization of Southern hardwoods, and $35,000 is for the development of new and fuller utilization of forest resources of the Northeast.

Amendment No. 35, forest economics: Retains the Senate increase of $10,000, partially restoring a House cut of $11,386, for continuing economic studies in the anthracite region under the Alleghany Forst Experiment Station, the work to be completed by the end of the fiscal year 1945.

Amendments Nos. 36, 37, 38, and 40, forest fire cooperation: Appropriates $6,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,529,062 as proposed by the House; strikes out the Senate provision making $50,000 available for studies of the effect of tax laws and timber insurance; and accepts the Senate provision authorizing expenditure of $1,000,000 of the appropriation, without matching, on critical areas of national importance, amended so as to require that the areas in question must be extremely critical.

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $3,920,985 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,952,585 as proposed by the House. The

House provision that there must be progressive and final liquidation during the fiscal year 1945 was stricken out by the Senate. This amendment (No. 41) is reported in disagreement.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 44, 45, and 46: The House bill prohibits the use of the appropriation for wage stabilization and reduced the appropriation by $800,000, which had been earmarked by the Budget for that work. The Senate bill restores $400,000 of the House cut and permits wage stabilization where a "substantial number" of the producers of a commodity affected request the intervention of the War Food Administrator. The House accepts the Senate restoration of $400,000 and also the provision permitting wage stabilization, but amended so as to provide that a "majority", instead of a "substantial number", of the producers within the area affected must request the intervention. The House accepts the Senate increase of $1,100,000, inserted to cover the cost of administration of food orders herctofore covered by assessments against producers and handlers, and also accepts the Senate provision permitting assessments against the growers of walnuts.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 47, salaries and administrative expenses: Authorizes $7,208,526 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,458,526 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House figure is on account of the dairy-production-payment program, estimated to cost $400,000,000. The conferees of both Houses join in the statement contained in the Senate report that the allowance of this increase "shall not be construed as approving any subsidy program now in effect or hereafter to be promulgated by this agency".

Amendment No. 49, sale of perishable fruits and vegetables at prices below parity permitted: Both Houses have approved the provision prohibiting the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price, except any commodity substantially deteriorated in quality, and the Senate has enlarged this exception to include perishable commodities where there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks. The House accepts the Senate provision, amended to apply to perishable "fruits and vegetables" instead of perishable "commodities".

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51, agricultural program payments: The House appropriated $290,000,000; the Senate appropriated $250,000,000, together with a transfer of $40,000,000 from the permanent appropriation known as the "30-percent fund"; the Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55, salaries and other administrative expenses: Amendment No. 54 allots $24,250,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and other administrative expenses. Amendment No. 55 strikes out the House provision relating to the money allotted under Amendment No. 54, as follows: "but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the appropriation account 'Agricultural Adjustment Agency', shall be so transferred". The Senate recedes on both amendments.

Amendment No. 57, State A. A. A. committees to approve farming practices prescribed for the agricultural program for 1945: Restores the House language, stricken out by the Senate, requiring the approval of State A. A. A. committees of the farming practices to be prescribed for the 1945 agricultural program.

Amendment No. 58: Makes the appropriation available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or soil-terracing services as grants in aid to agricultural producers in carrying out farm practices for the 1946 program, as provided by the Senate, as well as for the 1944 and 1945 programs as provided by both Houses. The inclusion of the Senate provision for 1946 is not to be construed as a committal to the agricultural program for 1946.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Amendment No. 61: Reappropriates $350,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $420,000 as proposed by the Senate, for continuance of liquidation during 1945. Under the provision approved by both Houses, this agency is forbidden to write any insurance on crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 62: Restores the House language, stricken out by the Senate, amended so as to limit to the State of Missouri the provision that agreements between the United States and State soil conservation districts shall have the prior approval of the central State agency established for the purpose.

MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 64, market news service: Retains the Senate increases of $2,000 for livestock market reports at Baltimore, Md., and $2,000 for dairy and poultry reports at New Orleans, La.

FARM TENANCY

Amendment No. 67, farm-tenant loans: Provides $15,000,000 of R. F. C. funds as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $1,025,000 for water facilities for arid and semiarid areas. The House recedes.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 69, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,550,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70, loans: Provides $25,000,000, instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House report the following amendments in disagreement:

Amendments Nos. 5, 7, and 31, salaries: Authorize salaries as follows: Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, $10,000; Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration, $9,200; Chief Forester, Forest Service, $9,200. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendments Nos. 9 through 14, reclassification of veterinarians and lay assistants, Bureau of Animal Industry: The Senate amendments provide $996,821 in excess of the amount provided by the House, for the Bureau of Animal Industry, to cover the cost of the proposed reclassification of veterinarians and their lay assistants. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 17, agricultural engineering investigations: Authorizes not to exceed $10,000 of the appropriation, for construction of a machine shop and laboratory building at the Department's sugar plant field station at Houma, Louisiana. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 25, barberry eradication: Appropriates $283,470, instead of $258,470 as proposed by the House. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 27, Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry: The House language limits to $15,000 the total cost for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings outside the District of Columbia. The Senate has stricken out the House language and inserted a provision limiting to $7,500 the cost of any one building and limiting to 2 per centum of the cost of any one building or to $500, whichever is greater, expenditures for alterations to any one building in a fiscal year. The House managers will propose language in lieu of both the House and Senate provisions, as follows: *"Provided,* That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, but in no event to exceed $2,500."

Amendment No. 40, forest fire cooperation: Authorizes the expenditure of $1,000,000 of the appropriation, without matching by State and private owners, for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment inserting the word "extremely" before the words "critical areas."

Amendment No. 41, emergency rubber project: Strikes out the House language requiring final liquidation of the project during the fiscal year 1935. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 43, War Food Administration: Authorizes not to exceed $20,000 for travel expenses to and from their homes of consultants employed intermittently away from their homes on a per diem when actually employed basis. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 48, Commodity Credit Corporation, determining parity price of ⅞-inch Middling cotton: Requires the Corporation to use the same method as is used for determining such parity price at the average location used in fixing the basic loan rate. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53, incentive payments: Amendment No. 52 appropriates $12,500,000 for incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes. Amendment No. 53 strikes out the House provision prohibiting incentive payments except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the 1944 Agricultural Conservation Program bulletin, dated February 9, 1944. The House managers will move to recede and concur in amendment No. 52 and to recede and concur with an amendment to No. 53, restoring the language stricken out by the Senate, amended so as to permit incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes.

Amendment No. 59, War Food Administration: Provides as follows: *"Provided further,* That the War Food Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 Agricultural Conservation Program with respect to any farm if the War Food Administration determines that the producer would have been eligible for such payments except for the failure of such producer, because of negligence of an officer or agent of the Federal Government, to file on or before June 30, 1943, Form ACP-140, and such payments shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774)."

The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 60, political activity: Strikes out the House provision prohibiting certain political activities on the part of persons whose salaries are paid from the appropriations carried in the act. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 63, school milk and lunch program: Authorizes use of $50,000,000 of the so-called 30 percent fund for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment, striking out the Senate language and

substituting in lieu thereof the pertinent language of the Senate amendment to the Pace bill (H. R. 4278) as amended by the House on June 1. This will provide $50,000,000 from the same source but under the language contemplated for the Pace bill, omitting the paragraph of the Pace bill which authorizes further appropriations.

Amendment No. 65, Farm Security Administration: Appropriates $28,265,000 for administrative expenses and grants and provides $96,710,000 of R. F. C. funds for loans. The House managers will move to recede and concur with amendments providing $26,000,000 for administrative expenses and grants and $67,500,000 of R. F. C. funds for loans.

Amendment No. 66, salaries and expenses, Farm Tenancy Act: Appropriates $1,500,000, instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the introduction given me today at Winchester, Va., by the Honorable W. Nelson Page and the memorial remarks I made under the auspices of the Stonewall Memorial Association and the Turner Ashby Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, entitled "They Are Not Dead."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special order for today I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand the O. P. A. bill will not be called up today?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. The rule will not, either.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a news release of mine appearing in the Kickapoo Scout, Soldiers Grove, Wis., under date of June 1, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made awhile ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of June 5, 1944.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of provisions with which I am not in agreement in this conference report. For instance, the Senate placed in the bill an amendment increasing by several million dollars the appropriation for the State Department. It provides for the appointment of several hundred additional employees. This was done after the bill passed the House committee, although it was stated while the bill was before the House committee that a reorganization was in progress down there. When representatives of the State Department were asked whether or not the reorganization would save any money, they very frankly said that it would cost more. They did not state, as I recall, how much more it was going to cost. Now we find that it is going to cost several million dollars more.

It would seem to me, in times such as these, that reorganizations should be made with a view to saving money rather than creating several hundred new positions and providing for the spending of additional money.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There is before the Committee on Foreign Affairs at the present time a bill having to do with creating more jobs and raising the pay in the State Department. It seems to me, until that measure is acted upon, that there might be no authorization in law for these expenditures.

Mr. CARTER. I was not aware of the bill to which the gentleman from Ohio refers, but it seems to me that the creation of these additional positions could well wait until the legislative committee has gone thoroughly over the situation and decided what additional positions are necessary.

I appreciate that the State Department at the present time has an unusual responsibility, not only in carrying out the work that it is carrying on, but also looking forward to a post-war program. I would like to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the State Department, year after year, before they made this final splurge of several hundred additional employees, has been given additional employees.

When I first became a member of this committee, the total apropriation for the State Department, as I recall, was about $18,000,000. Today we find that the State Department is asking for $47,000,000. They have been given additional employees all along.

In asking for the number that they are asking for now, when there is a manpower shortage throughout the country,

78TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1605

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

JUNE 6, 1944.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. TARVER, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4443]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 24, 33, 37, 50, 51, 54, 55, 57, 67, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47, 56, 58, 64, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,160,552*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,375,236*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment c the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendmen insert the following: *Provided, That the cost of erecting any one building except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2, 500, an the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 pe centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichere is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500*; and the Senate agree to th same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendmen of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$353,639* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendmen of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$25,000* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendmen of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$951,611* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$506,348* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$71,000*; an the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment o the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendmen as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendmen insert the following: *Provided further, That no part of this appropria tion shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to an commodity unless a majority of the producers of such commodity withi the area affected have requested the interrention of the Administrator o the War Food Administration*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of he Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment s follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment nsert the following: *(or in the case of perishable fruits and vegetables f there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks)*; and the enate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of he Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment s follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$350,000*; nd the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of he Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment s follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to ead as follows: *: Provided further, That in the State of Missouri vhere the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter nto agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies nd general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal id to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made y or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation istrict shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before hey shall become effective as to such district*; and the Senate agree to he same.

Amendment numbered 70:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of he Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment s follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$25,000,000*; nd the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments umbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 27, 31, 40, 41, 43, 48, 52, 3, 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, and 71.

M. C. Tarver,
Clarence Cannon,
Harry R. Sheppard,
Elmer H. Wene,
Everett M. Dirksen,
Managers on the part of the House.

Richard B. Russell,
Carl Hayden,
M. E. Tydings,
J. H. Bankhead,
Gerald P. Nye,
Arthur Capper,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

CORRECTIONS OF TEXT, PUNCTUATION, ETC.

The following amendments are for clarification, or in correction of allocations, the text, punctuation, and other technical corrections: Nos. 2; 3, 4, 8, 28, 29, 30, 39, and 56.

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 1, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,930,632, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,830,632, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 6, economic investigations: Appropriates $2,375,236, instead of $2,325,236 as proposed by the House and $2,475,236 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Amendment No. 15, cost of buildings: Limits the cost of buildings to $2,500 and the cost of alterations to any one building during the fiscal year 1945 to $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building, whichever is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17, agricultural engineering investigations: Appropriates $20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for mechanization of sugar-beet agriculture, and $40,000, instead of $65,000 as proposed by the Senate, for improvement of labor-saving machinery for sugarcane production, and retains the Senate provision making $10,000 available for construction of a building at Houma, La.

Amendment No. 18, cereal crops and diseases: Accepts the Senate proposal restoring the Budget reduction of $4,778 to permit continuation of cereal-improvement work at Dickinson, N. Dak., and restoring the decrease of $150 at Tucumcari, N. Mex.

Amendment No. 19, dry-land agriculture: Accepts the Senate proposal restoring the Budget reduction of $10,163 to permit continuance of the station at Lawton, Okla., and restoring $2,400 to permit the continuance of cooperative work at Moro, Oreg.

Amendment No. 20, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: Appropriates $5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for continuation of work to develop practical control methods for azalea flower-spot disease.

Amendment No. 21, plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: ppropriates $8,913, as proposed by the Senate, for continuance of he station at Savannah, Ga.

Amendment No. 22, soil surveys: Eliminates the Senate restoration f the House cut of $12,000.

Amendment No. 23, tobacco investigations: Appropriates $12,500, s proposed by the Senate, for work in North Carolina on burley obacco.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 24, citrus canker eradication: Strikes out the enate provision making an appropriation of $11,300.

Amendment No. 26, foreign parasites: Reduces to $5,000 the enate increase of $10,000. The Senate report indicates the increase s for work on the Klamath weed. By agreement of the conferees of oth Houses, the Department will have discretion in the application f the fund.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Amendment No. 27, cost of buildings: Limits the cost of buildings o $7,500 and the cost of alterations to any one building during the iscal year 1945 to $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building, whichver is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 32, forest management: The House bill provided $10,000 for work in connection with the control of the spruce budworm. The Senate proposed an increase of $15,000 over the House igure. The conference report retains $7,500 of the Senate increase.

Amendment No. 33, range investigations: Strikes out the Senate ncrease of $35,000, of which $10,000 was for research in converting ut-over Douglas fir lands to grazing and $25,000 was for study of ivestock and big-game grazing in the intermountain region.

Amendment No. 35, forest products: Retains the Senate increase of $55,000, of which $20,000 is an increase over the House item of $15,000 for studies of the utilization of southern hardwoods, and $35,000 is for the development of new and fuller utilization of forest resources of the Northeast.

Amendment No. 35, forest economics: Retains the Senate increase of $10,000, partially restoring a House cut of $11,386, for continuing economic studies in the anthracite region under the Alleghany Forest Experiment station, the work to be completed by the end of the fiscal year 1945.

Amendments Nos. 36, 37, 38, and 40, forest-fire cooperation: Appropriates $6,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,529,062, as proposed by the House; strikes out the Senate provision making $50,000 available for studies of the effect of tax laws and timber insurance; and accepts the Senate provision authorizing expenditure of $1,000,000 of the appropriation, without matching, on critical areas of national importance, amended so as to require that the areas in question must be extremely critical.

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

Amendment No. 42: Reappropriates $3,020,985, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,952,585, as proposed by the House. The House provision that there must be progressive and final liquidation during the fiscal year 1945 was stricken out by the Senate. This amendment (No. 41) is reported in disagreement.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 44, 45, and 46: The House bill prohibits the use of the appropriation for wage stabilization and reduced the appropriation by $800,000, which had been earmarked by the Budget for that work. The Senate bill restores $400,000 of the House cut and permits wage stabilization where a "substantial number" of the producers of a commodity affected request the intervention of the War Food Administrator. The House accepts the Senate restoration of $400,000 and also the provision permitting wage stabilization, but amended so as to provide that a "majority", instead of a "substantial number", of the producers within the area affected must request the intervention. The House accepts the Senate increase of $1,100,000, inserted to cover the cost of administration of food orders heretofore covered by assessments against producers and handlers, and also accepts the Senate provision permitting assessments against the growers of walnuts.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 47, salaries and administrative expenses: Authorizes $7,208,526, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,458,526, as proposed by the House. The increase over the House figure is on account of the dairy-production-payment program, estimated to cost $400,000,000. The conferees of both Houses join in the statement contained in the Senate report that the allowance of this increase "shall not be construed as approving any subsidy program now in effect or hereafter to be promulgated by this agency".

Amendment No. 49, sale of perishable fruits and vegetables at prices below parity permitted: Both Houses have approved the provision prohibiting the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price, except any commodity substantially deteriorated in quality, and the Senate has enlarged this exception to include perishable commodities where there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks. The House accepts the Senate provision, amended to apply to perishable "fruits and vegetables" instead of perishable "commodities".

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51, agricultural program payments: The House appropriated $290,000,000; the Senate appropriated $250,000,000, together with a transfer of $40,000,000 from the permanent appropriation known as the "30-percent fund"; the Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55, salaries and other administrative expenses: Amendment No. 54 allots $24,250,000, as proposed by the

House, instead of $25,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and other administrative expenses. Amendment No. 55 strikes out the House provision, relating to the money allotted under amendment No. 54, as follows:

but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the appropriation account "Agricultural Adjustment Agency" shall be so transferred".

The Senate recedes on both amendments.

Amendment No. 57, State Agricultural Adjustment Administration committees to approve farming practices prescribed for the agricultural program for 1945: Restores the House language, stricken out by the Senate, requiring the approval of S ate Agricultural Adjustment Administration committees of the farming practices to be prescribed for the 1945 agricultural program.

Amendment No. 58: Makes the appropriation available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or soil-terracing services as grants in aid to agricultural producers in carrying out farm practices for the 1946 program, as provided by the Senate, as well as for the 1944 and 1945 programs as provided by both Houses. The inclusion of the Senate provision for 1946 is not to be construed as a committal to the agricultural program for 1946.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Amendment 61: Reappropriates $350,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $420,000 as proposed by the Senate, for continuance of liquidation during 1945. Under the provision approved by both Houses this agency is forbidden to write any insurance on crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 62: Restores the House language, stricken out by the Senate, amended so as to limit to the State of Missouri the provision that agreements between the United States and State soil conservation districts shall have the prior approval of the central State agency established for the purpose.

MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 64, market news service: Retains the Senate increases of $2,000 for livestock market reports at Baltimore, Md., and $2,000 for dairy and poultry reports at New Orleans, La.

FARM TENANCY

Amendment No. 67, farm tenant loans: Provides $15,000,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $1,025,000 for water facilities for arid and semiarid areas. The House recedes.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 69, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,550,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,750,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70, loans: Provides $25,000,000, instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House report the following amendments in disagreement:

Amendments Nos. 5, 7, and 31, salaries: Authorize salaries as follows: Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, $10,000; Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration, $9,200; Chief Forester, Forest Service, $9,200. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendments Nos. 9 through 14, reclassification of veterinarians and lay assistants, Bureau of Animal Industry: The Senate amendments provide $996,821 in excess of the amount provided by the House, for the Bureau of Animal Industry, to cover the cost of the proposed reclassification of veterinarians and their lay assistants. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 17, agricultural engineering investigations: Authorizes not to exceed $10,000 of the appropriation, for construction of a machine shop and laboratory building at the Department's sugar plant field station at Houma, La. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 25, barberry eradication: Appropriates $283,470, instead of $258,470 as proposed by the House. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 27, Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry: The House language limits to $15,000 the total cost for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings outside the District of Columbia. The Senate has stricken out the House language and inserted a provision limiting to $7,500 the cost of any one building and limiting to 2 percent of the cost of any one building or to $500, whichever is greater, expenditures for alterations to any one building in a fiscal year. The House managers will propose language in lieu of both the House and Senate provisions, as follows:

Provided, That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, but in no event to exceed $2,500.

Amendment No. 40, Forest-fire cooperation: Authorizes the expenditure of $1,000,000 of the appropriation, without matching by State and private owners, for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment inserting the word "extremely" before the words "critical areas".

Amendment No. 41, emergency-rubber project: Strikes out the House language requiring final liquidation of the project during the fiscal year 1945. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 43, War Food Administration: Authorizes not to exceed $20,000 for travel expenses to and from their homes of consultants employed intermittently away from their homes on a per diem when actually employed basis. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 48, Commodity Credit Corporation, determining parity price of ⅞-inch Middling cotton: Requires the Corporation to use the same method as is used for determining such parity price at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53, incentive payments: Amendment No. 52 appropriates $12,500,000 for incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes. Amendment No. 53 strikes out the House provision prohibiting incentive payments except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944. The House managers will move to recede and concur in amendment No. 52 and to recede and concur with an amendment to No. 53, restoring the language stricken out by the Senate, amended so as to permit incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes.

Amendment No. 59, War Food Administration: Provides as follows:

Provided further, That the War Food Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 Agricultural Conservation Program with respect to any farm if the War Food Administration determines that the producer would have been eligible for such payments except for the failure of such producer, because of negligence of an officer or agent of the Federal Government, to file on or before June 30, 1943, Form ACP–140, and such payments shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 32 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774).

The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 60, political activity: Strikes out the House provision prohibiting certain political activities on the part of persons whose salaries are paid from the appropriations carried in the act. The House managers will move to insist.

Amendment No. 63, school milk and lunch program: Authorizes use of $50,000,000 of the so-called 30-percent fund for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment, striking out the Senate language and substituting in lieu thereof the pertinent language of the Senate amendment to the Pace bill (H. R. 4278), as amended by the House on June 1. This will provide $50,000,000 from the same source but under the language contemplated for the Pace bill, omitting the paragraph of the Pace bill which authorizes further appropriations.

Amendment No. 65, Farm Security Administration: Appropriates $28,265,000 for administrative expenses and grants and provides $96,710,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for loans. The House managers will move to recede and concur with amend-

ments providing $26,000,000 for administrative expenses and grants and $67,500,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for loans.

Amendment No. 66, salaries and expenses, Farm Tenancy Act: Appropriates $1,500,000, instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON
HENRY R. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

O

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE 78th-2nd, No. 110
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(Issued June 15, 1944, for actions of Wednesday, June 14, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations..1,2,4,5,6
Banking and currency...14
Budget Bureau.....2
Commodity Credit.....17
Debt limit.....16
Disbursing officers.....7
Electrification.....23
Farm wages.....20,33
Food adm. (general)....10
Food distribution...25,32
Food production.....31
Foreign relief.....4
Forestry.....11
Labor standards.....24
Legislative program.....6
Lend-lease.....4
Loans, farm.....30
Personnel.....2,15
Plant quarantine.....18
Post-war planning.....9
Price control..3,12,21,28
Priorities.....26,34
Rationing.....3,22,29
Senate confirmation.....2
Small business.....9
T.V.A.....2
Taxation.....16
Textiles.....3
Transportation.....19,27
Vehicles.....2
Veterans.....13
War progress.....8

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to conference report on this bill, H.R. 4443 (pp. 6008-9). (For provisions of the conference report, see Digest 103.) Agreed to Rep. Tarver's (Ga.) motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendmen relating to salaries of the Chiefs of FS and BAE and the ARAdministrator (pp. 6009-10). Rep. Tarver moved to insist upon disagreement to the Senate amendment relating to proposed increases in salaries of veterinarians and lay assistants in the field service of BAI after which Rep. Gillie, Ind., moved to recede and concur in these same amendments (p. 6010). Action was not completed on either motion, but several Members spoke in favor of Rep. Gillie's motion to which Rep. Tarver stated, "If we start raising salaries...for field employees of one bureau. we are going to find ourselves confronted...with requests from numerous other organizations of the Government for similar consideration, and, unless we are prepared to go the whole way and increase the salaries of everybody who make out an equally good case, we should not begin by establishing this precedent, at this time" (p. 6012).

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the second conference report on this bill, H.R. 4070 (p. 5983). The conference report, among other things, limits to four the number of field offices that the Budget Bureau may establish outside D.C.; prohibits use of CSC funds for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit; strikes out the Senate amendments relating to TVA financial operations and restores the House language; and strikes out the Senate amendment providing for Senate confirmation of persons receiving $4,500 or more and restores the House language prohibiting the use of funds to pay any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of such nomination. The amendments relating to covering TVA receipts into the Treasury under one fund (House) or into the general fund of the Treasury (Senate) and to the marking and use of Government vehicles were re-

ported in disagreement.

3. PRICE CONTROL; RATIONING. Passed with an amendment S. 1764, to amend the Price Control and Stabilization Acts (pp. 5985-6007). Agreed to Rep. Spence's motion to consider this bill, after passing H.R. 4941, and to his amendment to substitute the House language therein (p. 6007). Rep. Spence, Brown of Ga., Barry, Monroney, Wolcott, Crawford, and Gamble were appointed conferees (p. 6007).

Agreed to Rep. Pace's (Ga.) amendment requiring processors of agricultural commodities to pay producers prices established by law before the processor can charge or collect maximum prices for his products (pp. 5992-4).

Rejected amendments by Rep. Crawford, Mich., 103-189, to prohibit the establishment of maximum prices on agricultural commodities which will reflect to producers a price lower than the price standards established by Public Law 729, 77th Cong., amending the Price Control Act (pp. 5985-91); by Rep. Brown, Ga., 87-191, relating to maximum prices on cotton textiles (pp. 5991-2); and the following amendments that had been agreed to in the Committee of the Whole: By Rep. Disney, Okla., 178-204, relating to price ceilings on petroleum and requiring such prices to be not less than 80% of parity and not more than parity (p. 6005); by Rep. Gifford, Pa., 107-200, to provide that fish prices shall reflect the highest average price for such commodity for the year 1942, or reflect to producers prices or wages equal to the highest wages or prices paid to such producers (p. 6006); and by Rep. Towe, N. J., to strike out the word "general" in Sec. 202 (J) so as to give the Price Administrator more authority to eliminate inequities in cases where the maximum price is based on specifications or standards in use (p. 6006).

4. LEND-LEASE, UNRRA, AND FEA APPROPRIATION BILL. Reps. Cannon of Mo., Woodrum, Ludlow, Snyder, O'Neal, Rabaut, Johnson of Okla., Taber, Wigglesworth, Lambertson, and Powers were appointed conferees on this bill H. R. 4937 (p. 5984). Senate conferees were appointed June 13.

5. NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the conference report on this bill, H.R. 4551 (pp. 5983-4). The conferees struck out the Senate provision for the resale to the original owners of Okla. land found to contain oil after acquisition by the Navy.

Rep. Voorhis, Calif., urged rejection of the Disney oil amendment, the Dirksen court review amendment, and the Cravens amendment "setting up a brand new theory of jurisprudence" (pp. 5981-2).

6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader McCormack announced that the agricultural appropriation bill conference report will go over until Mon., June 19; and that the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill will be considered tomorrow (June 15) followed by the War Department appropriation bill and other conference reports (p. 6015).

7. DISBURSING OFFICERS. Received Treasury's proposed legislation to authorize certain transactions by disbursing officers of the U.S. To Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee. (p. 6016.)

8. WAR PROGRESS. Military Affairs Committee submitted an interim report pursuant to H.Res. 30, authorizing a study on the progress of the war effort (H. Rept. 1638) (p. 6016).

SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting June 15, Thurs.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct section and paragraph numbers.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1764 and insert therein the provisions of H. R. 4941 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1764, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Speaker appointed the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, BARRY, MONRONEY, WOLCOTT, CRAWFORD, and GAMBLE.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JUNE 13, 1944.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Eleventh Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. James A. O'Leary, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BUCK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending the remarks I made today I may include a statement from the Treasury Department on the circulation of United States money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial tribute to Vice Admiral Waesche.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain extracts from reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article and a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from General Marshall and my reply, and an article written by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of Monday, June 12, be corrected so that in line 7 of the fourth paragraph on page A3187, in a speech I made in the House on Saturday, June 10, the words "on the one hand" may be stricken out. This simply corrects the grammar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Flag Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. W. M. Floyd, national commander of the Regular Veterans' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. NORTON and Mr. ROLPH asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post on the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address on Flag Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the correct and officially signed resolution passed by the Polish-American Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in the first to include a resolution adopted at the thirty-ninth annual conference of the Municipal Finance Officers Association, and in the second to include an address delivered at that conference by Ralph L. Vannane, secretary of the New York City Employees Retirement System. In connection with the latter request, I understand that it will exceed the limit, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by me to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I delivered on May 21.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, appreciating the distinguished services of their chairman, will hold exercises on Friday, June 16, at 10 o'clock, in the committee room of that committee in the Old House Office Building, honoring the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, of Virginia. We would be delighted to have such Members of the House as can attend join us in these exercises. It gives me great pleasure to extend this invitation to all the Members of the House on behalf of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'TOOLE and Mr. HARTLEY asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by the regional forester of the Northwest, H. J. Andrews, and in the other to include an article by Dorothy Thompson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of Jews in up-State New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4443), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk began to read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 6, 1944.)

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this report having been printed in the RECORD of Tuesday of last week I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the report may be dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] a question.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I should be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi when discussion begins on the conference report. Could not the gentleman from Mississippi wait until that time?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, there was inadvertently omitted from the statement of the managers a statement which had been agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees as to the application of a reduction of $29,200 in the appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this addition to the statement of the managers may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

When this bill was reported to the House, it carried a reduction of $29,200 below the Budget estimate in the appropriation for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary. The report accompanying the bill indicated the cut was to be applied to the Secretary's immediate office. When the Senate committee reported the bill to the Senate it did not restore any part of the reduction, which had been ratified by House action, but the Senate committee's report recommended that "the $29,200 reduction be applied not solely to the immediate Office of the Secretary but rather that it be spread throughout the various items financed under this appropriation." At the meeting of the conference between the House and the Senate this conflict between the committee reports to the two bodies was considered and it was agreed that 50 percent of the reduction should be applied as indicated in the House report and that the remaining 50 percent should be applied as indicated in the Senate report. It was further agreed that a statement of the foregoing should be incorporated in the statement of the House managers accompanying the conference report.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, by inadvertence, this matter was omitted from the statement of the House managers and I am, therefore, including it in my remarks to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the bill the Senate provided $40,000,000 for rural electrification and the conferees cut that down to $25,000,000. Of course, there is a great scarcity of materials now, but there are $100,000,000 worth of applications now pending with the Rural Electrification Administration. I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia if the thing should take such a turn that materials should be made available, what the chances would be for us to get a deficiency appropriation to take care of it?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi, I wish to point out that the report of the conferees provides for $25,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TARVER. It provides $25,000,000 for the Rural Electrification Administration, which is $5,000,000 in excess of the Budget estimate and which, together with the unobligated balance which will be on hand at the end of the present fiscal year, should be amply sufficient to take care of the needs of the Rural Electrification Administration for the

next fiscal year. May I point out to the gentleman that while allocations in excess of $28,000,000 have been made by the R. E. A. for the present fiscal year, there has been only expended until June 9, 1944, according to a statement from Mr. Vincent D. Nicholson, Deputy Administrator, which I have before me, and which is dated today, of $33,500,000 made available in the 1944 agricultural appropriation act, considering the reappropriation of the unexpended balance of $13,500,000, $1,961,676?

In other words, while allocations in excess of $28,000,000 have been made, there has been actually spent of the money made available for this fiscal year, only slightly less than $2,000,000. That, of course, does not include amounts paid out from appropriations and on allocations made in previous years. Our conferees, while they are very much interested in the work of the Rural Electrification Administration, and believe in making adequate provision for it, have seen no reason for making provision largely in excess of any anticipated needs and largely in excess of budget estimates, and for that reason we have agreed with the Senate on only an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget, which gives $25,000,000 to them. I am not a member of the Deficiency Committee, but I certainly hope that if a condition should come about under which materials may be available for rural electric line construction to a greater degree than is now anticipated, the Deficiency Subcommittee may bring in a bill making additional appropriations if those be necessary. But I want to point out this, that Mr. Nicholson advised me personally today that unless a change occurs in the present situation there will be no necessity for the appropriation of more than the amount of $25,000,000 provided for in the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, I also discussed this matter with Mr. Nicholson only a few moments ago and if conditions continue to improve from the standpoint of our military operations abroad, the chances are that materials would be made available. If they are, we are going to need a great deal more even than was provided by the Senate amendment. What I want to know, and if the gentleman will yield to me further so that I can ask the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations who is, I believe, the chairman of the Committee on Deficiency Appropriations, if that should occur, we will need at least $100,000,000, and what I want to know is whether or not there would be a prospect of getting a deficiency appropriation in case that happens.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, if the chairman of the full committee, who is also chairman of the Committee on Deficiency Appropriations, desires to answer the gentleman's question, I shall be glad for him to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that if the situation made it possible to make available the needed materials, the deficiency appropriation would be provided. Of course, that is merely my opinion, but judging by the importance of it and the interest of all the members of the committee, both of the subcommittee and the full committee, I have no doubt that a deficiency appropriation would be provided.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is there in the bill as it comes back to the House which has to do with the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. TARVER. There is an amendment relating to the Farm Security Administration making appropriations for the Farm Security Administration which is reported in disagreement, but with regard to which the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with amendments. The gentleman from Michigan will find all of that stated in the conference report.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report and the statement of the managers were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week, and unless there are other Members who desire to ask questions with regard to what is contained in the conference report I shall move the previous question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point for one further word with reference to the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. TARVER. We are going to reach that in the consideration of the amendment relating to the Farm Security Administration. It is not involved in the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I understand that, but I would like to know if the gentleman will agree to recognize me at the proper time to offer an amendment which has for its purpose the earmarking of $25,000,000 for the returned veterans and their families in the rehabilitation loans.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I have no thought of trying to offer an amendment to the conference report, but only to the amendment which is in controversy.

Mr. TARVER. We have not reached the Farm Security Administration amendment yet, and when we get to that I will be glad to have the gentleman from Oklahoma interrogate me further.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. What did the conference committee do about the farm seed request that was made by the nursery people?

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman refer to the incentive payments of $12,500.000 in the Senate bill?

Mr. JENSEN. No, there was a request made by the nursery people of this Nation that an appropriation be submitted to get more farm seeds to the farmer, farm seeds, such as clover, alfalfa, and some other kinds.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman evidently has reference to Senate amendments Nos. 52 and 53, relating to an appropriation of $12,500,000 for incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes. That will come up later. It is not in the conference report.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments in disagreement Nos. 5, 7, and 31 may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report amendments Nos. 5, 7, and 31 in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: On page 10, line 23, insert "including the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum."

Amendment No. 7: On page 16, line 17, insert "including the salary of the Administrator at $9,200 per annum."

Amendment No. 31: Page 49, line 20, insert "at $9,200 per annum."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 5, 7, and 31.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does this mean raising salaries without regard to the Classification Act?

Mr. TARVER. No. This means that if the motion which has been made by the managers on the part of the House, and which has been unanimously offered as I recall the action of these managers, is agreed to, these persons will continue to receive the same salaries they have been receiving heretofore and are now receiving.

Mr. TABER. Why is it necessary to have legislation?

Frankly I am bothered about this, because there is another amendment coming up later to raise another group of salaries. If we are going to start to do it here we are not in a very good position to support opposition to the rest of it.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that I am as strongly opposed to increasing the salaries of Federal employees at this time as he could possibly be. However, these salaries provided in this amendment, as I understand, are the same salaries that have been paid to these officials over a term of years. There is no increase involved. It has been necessary, as a matter of procedure under the House rules, to bring these amendments relating to these salaries back for the concurrence of the House, as they are legislative in character. There is no increase in the salaries carried in this year's Agriculture Department Appropriation Act, contemplated by these amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Amendments 9 through 14, inclusive, relate to proposed increases in salaries of veterinarians and lay assistants in the field service in the Bureau of Animal Industry. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: On page 22, line 10, strike out "$5,240,355" and insert "$5,433,232."

Amendment No. 10: On page 23, line 22, strike out "$114,288" and insert "$115,440."

Amendment No. 11: On page 24, line 8, strike out "$951,253" and insert "$1,003,130."

Amendment No. 12: On page 24, line 14, strike out "$8,616,759" and insert "$9,359,124."

Amendment No. 13: On page 24, line 21, strike out "$272,115" and insert "$279,228."

Amendment No. 14: On page 24, line 23, strike out "$37,007" and insert "$38,444."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments numbered 9 to 14, inclusive.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, with reference to these amendments in which I am very much interested, I would like to speak about the possibility of trying to raise the salaries of these men in the Bureau of Animal Industry.

As you all know, we are very proud of the Bureau of Animal Industry. It is one of the important divisions of the Government. Unless something is done to take care of this problem of salaries for these men, it is a question whether we will be able to hold those men in the Government service. Already 76 veterinarians have left the service and I understand before the end of the year there will be several others who will leave the Government because of the fact they cannot live on the salaries they are receiving at the present time.

The Civil Service Commission recognized the training of these men and their lay assistants for inspection service in controlling these animal diseases. For some reason the personnel in the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Service have not received the proper classification because of the lack of appropriation.

I ask you gentlemen, Is this fair? This group of employees entered the service with the earnest intent of serving their Government and applying their skill and training. They understood naturally that when they became more experienced, and their responsibilities increased they would be promoted to a higher grade, thus receiving compensation commensurate to the service rendered.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I inquire whether the gentleman intended to make a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments, so as to make effective these increases which the gentleman is now discussing?

Mr. GILLIE. That is just what I was about to do.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GILLIE moves to recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] that we recede and concur in the amendments which have been placed in this bill by the Senate. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] has stated, the people engaged in the industry have been very seriously handicapped by the low wages which have been paid. As a consequence, many of the veterinarians in the service, as well as the lay employees, have been seriously handicapped. Many of them have left the service. That service involves the important work of inspecting our meat industry, at a time when there is a very necessary demand for that service, not only in the matter of the hoof-and-mouth disease, Bangs disease, but in the inspection of meats, which not only go to the armed forces but to the people of this country.

This matter was discussed when the bill was before the House previously and I do hope we will recede and concur in the amendments which have been placed in the bill by the Senate, to authorize additional funds and to authorize increases in salaries, which are necessary.

I may say that most of these employees who have been in this service many years are grossly underpaid.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Those employees are necessary in the operation of the packing houses and slaughterhouses all over the country, are they not?

Mr. O'HARA. That is correct, and for the important job of seeing that the right kind of food goes out.

Mr. JENNINGS. And also in aiding those who are raising livestock for the market, so that they can have the aid of veterinarians when their stock gets sick.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman has expressed it most succinctly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The law also requires that the meat must be inspected by the veterinarians?

Mr. O'HARA. That is right. That is the peculiar situation we are in.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] for bringing to the attention of the House the real need for an increase in the pay of veterinarians at this time. It is necessary not only from the viewpoint of animal health but also from the viewpoint of human health.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] 3 minutes.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. If we are going to have discussion we ought to have the membership here to know what is going on.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. TABER. I cannot, because the membership should be here and hear both sides of this argument so they will know what is going on when they come to vote. I feel that we must have a quorum here.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes the gentleman from New York will withdraw the point of order temporarily, for there are certain matters on the Speaker's desk that should be taken care of.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the point of order temporarily.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall be delighted to withhold my argument.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 4941) to extend the period of operation of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and for other purposes, was passed will be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MURDOCK, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. FAY, for 5 days, on account of official business.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from New York to withdraw his point of no quorum temporarily in

order that I may address the House and place in the RECORD for the information of the other Members of the House the committee's position about this matter, after which if he desires, he may renew his point of no quorum.

Mr. TABER. Very well; I will withhold it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas object to the gentleman from Georgia making his statement?

Mr. TARVER. I have yielded time to 3 Members, 9 minutes, on the gentleman's side of the question; certainly the gentleman should not object to my placing in the RECORD a reply setting forth the committee's position.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman yielded only 3 minutes to the Members on this side of the House and would yield no more than 3 minutes to anyone in opposition to discuss this amendment. Now the gentleman is going to place a long statement in the RECORD.

Mr. TARVER. How does the gentleman know it is a long statement?

Mr. HOPE. Because the gentleman has said he was going to explain the committee's position.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman must know that I have many facts and therefore will require several minutes to state them. I assure the gentleman I will not take more than 9 minutes; and the gentleman surely will not object that that is any too much time in which to set forth the position of the committee and the conferees on this matter.

Mr. TABER. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps a statement might be extended in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. TARVER. I do not want to take the time to write out a statement. I will be glad to address the House and set forth the views of the committee and the conferees.

Mr. HOPE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withhold the point of order temporarily.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this is a salary-raising proposition pure and simple. We had it up when the bill was originally considered in the House, and the House overwhelmingly voted down amendments which proposed to restore to the bill the $996,000 which would be necessary if we increase as proposed the salaries of the 2,472 veterinarians and lay inspectors of the Bureau of Animal Industry. Remember that under the Overtime Pay Act of 1943 these employees have had increases of 21.6 percent within the last year or so which in the case of the average of these employees amounts to $452 per individual. Only about 800 of these employees are veterinarians; the rest are lay inspectors. They have not been, as stated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], although I am sure he was in good faith in making his statement, refused in prior years money to which they were entitled under the Reclassification Act because of the failure of Congress to appropriate necessary funds. They have been working for 10 years to secure reclassification so as to bring about an increase of their salaries, and it was only a few months ago that they were able to bring about action or recommendation on the part of the Civil Service Commission with reference to their reclassification which if made effective through making appropriations will, as stated, give them a further increase, an increase in addition to the one which they and all other Federal employees have had under the Overtime Pay Act, an increase of $289 per year per individual on the average of these 2,472 employees, as estimated by the Bureau, although $996,000 for this number of employees seems to average about $400 per employee.

This Congress has been propagandized by those claiming to represent these Federal employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry as much as they have been propagandized about any item in the agricultural appropriation bill. I have myself received hundreds of letters and telegrams and had long-distance calls from veterinarians in my State who were my friends urging me to consent to this proposed increase of a million dollars a year for the salaried personnel of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the field. I wish I could in good conscience agree with them. I have no more interest in it than you. I do not want to see the dam broken and the Congress begin to grant increases in salaries to Federal employees above the increases provided in the overtime pay act of 1943. You will get the same proposition in the conference report on the appropriation bill for the legislative branch and judiciary that is coming in here for consideration in a day or so, perhaps tomorrow. The Senate has placed back in that bill $300,000 for increasing the salaries of clerks to district and circuit judges. If you do this, why you ought to do that; if you do that, perhaps you will not have any ground upon which you can deny the claim to increases of various other organizations of Government employees that will come here and ask for it just as sure as you are sitting here this afternoon.

The representatives of these men, the lobbyists who have appeared here for the men, not the men themselves, have said that these men are doing an important work for the Government which, of course, they are, an exceedingly important work, but that they will not continue unless they get an increase in salary. In other words, these veterinarians are being paid from $2,000 to $4,800 a year for inspecting meat for our armed forces that they are using in the field, the armed forces that in many instances or most instances are fighting for $50 a month and dying over there today in too many thousands of cases on the shores of France. They say, "We are not going to carry on the work of inspecting meat for our armed forces in the field unless you increase our salaries. It is true you have given us an increase of $452 a year each on the average in the last year, but unless you increase our salaries again and give us $289 or $400 in addition we are going to quit this work and we are going into other employment where we will be more liberally paid."

Mr. Speaker, the farm hand down in my country and out in your country who wants to leave the farm and go to an industrial plant and get three or four times as much money as he earned on the farm cannot do that unless he gets a certificate of availability from the United States Employment Office. But here it is said that these men who have had for many years jobs with which they were satisfied, who had good jobs during the depression when millions of people were unemployed, men who are engaged in this vitally necessary work, are in the attitude of saying, if the lobbyists appearing for them are correct in their interpretation of the statements made by the men, "We are going to quit this vitally important work we are engaged in and go to something else where we can get more money unles you again raise our salaries." So far as I am concerned I am not willing to do that and I hope the House will not do it.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact, however, that a great many have already quit their jobs because the salaries were not high enough? Is it not a further fact that the Department is having great difficulty in filling vacancies which now exist because the salaries are not high enough?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct to this extent: There have been quite a number who have left the employment of this bureau because their demand for increases in salaries have not been granted; however, the proportion is not very much greater than the loss of employees has been in some other bureaus and departments of the Government and less than in some. But does the gentleman want to yield when men engaged in vitally important work, vitally important to our armed forces, come in and put a gun at the head of Congress and say: "We are going to quit this vitally important work; we are going into something where we can make more money unless you increase our salaries beyond the increases which you granted last year to us and to other employees of the Federal Government"? Does the gentleman want to yield on that or does he want to take the same steps and apply to these men the same type of regulation or rule that is applicable to the farm hands in his district and mine and tell them: "You have to continue the essential work in which you are engaged for the period of the emergency unless you secure permission through the regular channels to change your employment"?

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman want me to answer the question he just asked?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. In reply to what the gentleman has said I may say that if the gentleman wishes to compare it with farm hands, farm hands all over the country have quit their jobs and have gone to work in munition factories at a great increase in pay. The men we are talking about now have not quit. They are men who have faithfully stayed

on the job and the demand that comes here is not from these men, as I understand it, it is from the livestock associations of this country and the people who are depending upon the good work which is done by this department and who know that the men are underpaid and who feel that they are worthy of an increase in salary comparable to the grade which they hold.

Mr. TARVER. The demands are coming from these men, because I have hundreds of letters and telegrams in my files from them. I do not believe the men who undertake to say they are going to quit their work unless they get additional salary increases are correctly representing these field employees. I believe the field employees are just as patriotic as any other men or employees of the Government. In my opinion, when men go before congressional committees and say that these veterinarians and lay employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry are going to quit this vital work unless they get a further salary raise, they are misrepresenting those men. I do not believe they will quit their work to any greater extent than other Government employees are quitting their jobs.

The gentleman states that farm hands are quitting their work. I assume he does not take issue with the statement I made that until they get a certificate of availability from the United States Employment Office they are not permitted to do it.

Mr. GILLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. The facts of the case are that these men have already quit and that is the thing we want to guard against. We want to keep this thing up to a high point of efficiency. Is it not true that about 65 percent of these men are getting a salary of $2,600 a year? Is it not a fact that 65 percent of these men are getting that?

Mr. TARVER. I do not know about what percentage are getting $2,600. I do know that some of them are getting $4,800 a year.

Mr. GILLIE. Only a few of them are.

Mr. TARVER. Others are receiving $2,000 a year and in between these figures. Whether it is a few or many who are getting $2,600, I am not in position to say, but it is more than these boys are getting who are dying in Normandy today and they are not threatening to quit, as far as I have been advised, unless their salaries are raised. Just why we should pick out one organization of the Government that has been busy propagandizing the Congress and tell them: "We will give you a salary increase beyond that which has been obtained by other groups of employees of the Government," I cannot understand.

If you will examine the hearings regarding the appropriation for the Social Security Board, you will find that the Social Security Board has lost 6,600 out of 10,000 employees, 2,500 to the armed services and 4,100 employees otherwise to better positions. Is someone going to come in here and say, "Increase the salaries of all the Social Security Board employees because they are finding it profitable to leave the service of the Social Security Board?"

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us the base pay of these men when they start in at these jobs as lay inspectors.

Mr. TARVER. I understand it is $1,600.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will give consideration to this matter prior to the time it passes upon the subject. If we start raising salaries by a million dollars for field employees of one bureau, we are going to find ourselves confronted in the not very distant future with requests from numerous other organizations of the Government for similar consideration, and, unless we are prepared to go the whole way and increase the salaries of everybody who make out an equally good case, we should not begin by establishing this precedent at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the issue is just this: Dr. Achter is one of the finest administrators in the Government. He went to the Bureau of the Budget and said to them that he could get no veterinarians and lay inspectors into the Government service on the present classification basis. He said to us in committee: "I have asked the Civil Service Commission to reduce the requirements in order to make it possible to get some of these inspectors and veterinarians for meat inspection and for quarantine where the health not only of the Army but the civilian population is involved."

In consequence, the only thing they could see was to propose that there be a reclassification which will cost something in excess of $900,000, involving some 2,400 people. The whole proposition is to set up an equitable basis to induce people to come to Government. I have not the slightest doubt but that the men who are serving Government in a scientific capacity will stay there, but we ought to be fair and ought to make it possible that one of the best administrators charged with that responsibility of Government be given a chance to get the scientific and professional men that he needs. That is the thing at issue, and that is the reason I supported this matter when the bill was first on the floor. I agree with the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana that we ought to recede and concur in the position taken by the Senate. The House did not include it. The Senate wrote back in this item that I offered on the floor, which was defeated. That is the only issue that is involved here.

LEGISLATION TO HELP VETERANS, THEIR WIDOWS AND DEPENDENTS, SERVICEMEN, SERVICEMEN, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about post-war planning for all people. Considerable thought has been and is being given to the post-war welfare of service men and women of this war and their dependents, veterans and widows of veterans of the World War and their dependents, and veterans and widow of veterans of the Spanish-American War and their dependents. Although it is an impossible task to blueprint and formulate completely plans for the future, these efforts in behalf of our service men and women just mentioned are timely and appropriate. Benjamin Franklin gave through one of his proverbs no better advice than "Don't put off until tomorrow what you can do today." Our returning service men and women will not want delay in their getting that to which they are entitled. Unquestionably the claims of veterans and dependents of veterans of other wars have been less speedily handled at times than they should have been.

The American people, expressing themselves through their Members of Congress and governmental authorities, have always endeavored to be considerate of servicemen and their dependents and veterans of former wars and their dependents. For many years it has been the policy of our Government to provide veterans and service people with hospitalization. One of these hospitals is at Longview, Tex., in the Third Congressional District, the district I have the honor to represent. Some veterans and their dependents have been provided with various amounts of compensation and benefits; in many instances the compensation and benefits should be increased and many more veterans and widows of veterans should be receiving compensation and benefits. Furthermore, it has been the intent of Congress that veterans and their widows when competing for civil-service positions receive several points preference with reference to Federal employment; not long ago the House passed a bill on this subject, which I supported.

Even some of the poorest States in the Confederacy after the War between the States rewarded and recognized their gallant soldiers and widows of these soldiers by granting them pensions and various types of help.

Four committees in the House—Pensions, Invalid Pensions, Military Affairs, and the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation—constantly give study to various ways by which veterans and their dependents may be helped. Each session of Congress finds many Members seeking to help veterans and their dependents through legislation. I personally have sought to help veterans, their widows, and dependents, our men in service, and their dependents by legislation.

In short, I am glad to say, in the 5½ years I have been in Congress, I actively and enthusiastically have supported every measure to aid and to raise the pay and compensation of our service men

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE 78th-2nd, No. 114
Legislative Reports and Service Section

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(Issued June 20, 1944, for actions of Monday, June 19, 1944)

(For staff of the Department only)

CONTENTS

A.A.A. grants in aid...8
Agricultural appropriation bill (individual items not indexed).....1
Appropriations.....1
2,3,28,29,31,32,33,46
Assistant Secretaries of State.....11
Census of agriculture...33
Claims.....15,22
Conservation.....5
Crop insurance.....12
Disbursing officers.....35
Farm legislation.....40
Feed.....42
Flood control.....38
Food distribution...41,42
Food production.....14
Foreign relief.....23
Forestry.....10
Grazing.....5,36
Health.....17
Insect control.....16
Irrigation.....38
Labor, farm.....13
Land acquisition.....7
Lands, public.....18
Latin America.....32
Loans, farm.....44
Machinery, farm.....25
Mail.....16
Minerals.....39
Nomination.....34
Personnel.....6,9,45
Post-war planning...19,37
Price control.....37,44
Purchasing.....4,43
Rationing.....21
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....24
Research.....47
Selective Service.....13
Small business.....20
Soil conservation.....30
Sugar.....21
Transportation.....19
Veterans.....6,18,45

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Continued action on the conference report on this bill, H.R. 4443 (pp. 6299-305, 6306-8). Agreed, 255-80, to Rep. Gillie's (Ind.) motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing for reclassification of meat inspectors' and veterinarians' salaries (pp. 6299-302); to Rep. Tarver's (Ga.) motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing for construction of a building at the BPI Houma (La.) station at not to exceed $10,000 (p. 6302); 188-132, to Rep. Holmes' (Wash.) motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing $283,470 for barberry eradication (pp. 6302-5); to Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide a $7,500 limitation on the cost of constructing any BA&IC building outside the D.C., and a $500 or 2%-of-the-cost limitation on the cost of alterations, whichever is greater (p. 6306); to Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to authorize expenditures of not to exceed $1,000,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on extremely critical areas of national importance (p. 6306); to Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment authorizing payment of travel expenses of intermittent employees of WFA (p. 6306); To Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment requiring CCC to use the same method as is used for determining such parity price at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate (p. 6306); to Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $12,500,000 for incentive payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes (p. 6306); to Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment restoring the House language prohibiting incentive payments (with certain exception) amended so as to permit payments for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes (p. 6306; to Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing for payments on Irish potato and commercial truck crops (p. 6306); and to Rep. Tarver's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment providing $50,000,000 for a school-lunch program (p. 6307).

Rep. Tarver requested unanimous consent for postponement of consideration of the amendments relating to the guayule rubber project, the AAA political activity prohibition (p. 6206), and the FSA 1-g-r-r item (pp. 6306-8).

2. STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL. Reps. Rabaut, Kerr, Hare, O'Brien, Carter, Stefan and Jones were appointed conferees on this bill H. R. 4204 (p. 6306).

3. WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the conference report on the bill, H.R. 4183 (pp. 6291-2). Conferees had been appointed earlier in the day (p. 6265). The conference report provides $100 (House figure; Senate, $400,100) for flood control (general) and strikes out the Senate language with regard to the promotion of the production of agricultural commodities essential to the war effort.

4. WAR CONTRACT TERMINATION BILL. Passed, 326-21, with amendments this bill, S. 1718. Conferees were appointed. (pp. 6267-8.)

5. RANGE CONSERVATION. Rep. Rockwell, Colo., commended and described the progress of range conservation by the Grazing Service (pp. 6311-2).

6. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 4320, on the computation of interest in contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from service (p. 6282). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Agreed to the Senate amendment with a clarifying amendment to H.R. 4292, to eliminate the necessity of paying interest on refunds of retirement deductions in the case of persons leaving the Government service after having served for not more than 1 year (p. 6281).

Discussed and on objection of Rep. Hoffman, Mich., passed over H.R. 4115, to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed (p. 6281).

Passed as reported S. 1232, to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Interior Department (p. 6276).

7. LAND ACQUISITION. At the request of Rep. Cole, N.Y., passed over S. 919, to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period (p. 6269).

8. A.A.A. GRANTS IN AID. At the request of Rep. Kean, N.J., passed over H.R. 340 requiring compliance with State inspection laws by Federal agencies, except for disbursing fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, and seeds (p. 6269).

9. ALIEN EMPLOYMENT. At the request of Rep. Kean, N.J., passed over H.R. 2908, amending Public Law 537, 77th Cong., to remove the date limitation for relieving disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees in respect to certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status (p. 6269).

10. FORESTRY. At the request of Rep. Cochran, Mo., passed over H.R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument (p. 6269).

11. ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE. At the request of Rep. Harness, Ind., passed over H.R. 4311, authorizing the appointment of 2 additional Assistant Secretaries of State (p. 6270).

group 15 to 35, tuberculosis is the principal cause of death. In the age group 20 to 34, 1 in every 6 deaths among white persons and 1 in every 3 deaths among Negroes is due to tuberculosis.

The facilities and personnel of local tuberculosis clinics are overtaxed. The armed forces induction and examining stations have refused and reported back to local health departments over 100,000 young men and women between 21 and 35 years of age. Over half of the States are unable to provide the necessary expert medical care and supervision for the treatment of these cases. Unless something is done to protect these persons against this insidious disease, young mothers and fathers and industrial workers will continue to contribute the major share of the deaths from tuberculosis each year.

If this bill were enacted, a real attack could be made on tuberculosis by, first, expanding small-film X-ray case finding on a Nation-wide scale to the entire adult population; second, by providing facilities and professional personnel throughout the country which are accessible to the major part of our population for supervision and treatment of ambulatory patients with early tuberculosis; and, third, by studies and investigations into newer methods of control of the disease. There is in particular an urgent need to study the effect on tuberculosis of some of the new chemotherapeutic agents, such as the sulphone derivatives. It will also be possible to make special studies of the application of electronics to the newly developed small-film equipment in order to still further simplify the method and increase its efficiency and decrease its already low cost.

Funds would be granted to State health authorities to assist them in establishing and improving local tuberculosis control offices. At the present time 26 of the 48 States have no full-time tuberculosis control officer and scarcely any professional personnel, clinic facilities, or field nursing services. Other States need to have their case-finding and follow-up programs greatly augmented in order to meet their local problems. Professional personnel will have to be trained for State and local work. Whenever possible, attempts would be made to use qualified persons who have recovered from tuberculosis and are ready to be rehabilitated. Graduates from the Cadet Nurse Corps will be a valuable source of new workers in the nursing aspects of the program.

The major share of the appropriation requested would be used to control the spread of tuberculosis among war workers and their families who have migrated from one community to another, and are not eligible, because of State residence requirements, for clinic and sanatorium care. The States have requested Federal assistance for the care and hospital treatment of these tuberculous workers and their family members who have broken down on the job. It is estimated that from six to seven millions dollars will be needed during the coming year to meet this special problem.

Tuberculosis is one of those diseases which are important not only from a public-health standpoint, but also from an economic view. Once the disease has become actively advanced, the patient is disabled either continuously for a long period of time, or death intervenes. Early diagnosis and treatment is an economy to the family in which the disease occurs and to the community which must bear the burden of support if the family is broken up for long periods by disability, or permanently by death.

Tuberculosis is a preventable cause of death. Recent developments now make it possible within a few years' time to locate at a moderate cost practically every case of tuberculosis in the population. The importance of widespread use of mass radiography everywhere in the country cannot be overemphasized. Having found the cases, careful clinical study, medical supervision, and treatment must be provided for those needing such care. By these means we can stop the human and economic waste of chronic disability and premature and unnecessary deaths from tuberculosis in the United States.

I strongly recommend the enactment of the proposed legislation.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House at this time what I consider a very worth while, as well as strong, endorsement of this legislation. I consider it important enough to bring to the attention of the House because of the experience and ability of the person who expresses the views. It is in the form of a letter addressed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction of the subject matter, by J. Lynn Mahaffey, M. D., director of health of the State of New Jersey. In endorsing the pending legislation, he said:

I write to seek your vigorous and wholehearted support of H. R. 4615, to establish, for the investigation and control of tuberculosis, a division in the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

Since the discovery of the tubercle bacillus as the causative agent of tuberculosis, much has been accomplished to eradicate this disease, which, since the beginning of time, has probably been the greatest killer of mankind. When it is considered that today our tuberculosis death rate approximates 44 per 100,000 population, as compared with 200 per 100,000 at the beginning of the century, and that for the past 15 or 16 years this disease has lost first place as a destroyer of human life and now takes seventh place, we realize how much has been accomplished. However, much still remains to be done.

There are over 50,000 tuberculosis deaths in these United States every year and for every death it is estimated that there are about 10 active cases of the disease, or approximately 500,000 cases. When we consider that at least 50 percent of these cases are to be found between the ages of 15 and 49—probably the most productive years of the average individual's life—some small idea is obtained of the magnitude of the problem that remains. Today it must also be realized that in wartime we are faced with all of the unfavorable circumstances, such as overcrowding, overwork, and concentration of workers, which tend to increase the spread of infection, and that the last world conflict sent tuberculosis rates soaring in the nations of Europe and brought about a slight rise even in this country. Alarming increases are again noted throughout Europe and no one can predict how extensive the damage will be.

Another problem will be the return of our troops from abroad. We are hearing a great deal about the danger from tropical diseases. Actually, the most common disease in most tropical regions is tuberculosis, because of the lack of elementary hygiene, poor housing, inadequate diet, contaminated food, and swarming flies. Our fighting men will return and will bring back tuberculosis. The problem of the tuberculous veteran is also concerned in this legislation for which I seek your support.

With the rapid advances in X-ray technique for discovering the unknown cases, with our modern methods of diagnosis and treatment, and our most complete knowledge of this disease, we hopefully look to the future as an era in which we can forecast its eventual eradication. For some time those who are engaged in the field of public health have realized that in order to broaden the attack to bring about that happy day of eradication, we have been sorely in need of more funds and a central bureau to coordinate and direct our efforts on a national level.

The bill for which favorable action is sought proposes just that, and, in my opinion, if enacted, would have an inestimable and lasting benefit to the citizens of this country.

In conclusion, permit me to say that endorsements of similar character have come from numerous medical associations, medical practitioners, welfare groups, and public authorities, both State and local.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which conducted hearings on the bill and unanimously recommended its passage, I urge the membership of the House to likewise approve it.

(Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the suspension of the rules and the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

EXTENSION OF CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING ACT OF 1939

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment to the bill (S. 1432) to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, ask for a conference with the Senate and appoint conferees.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. BULWINKLE, LEA, BECKWORTH, WOLVERTON of New Jersey, and HOLMES of Massachusetts.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the conference report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation

bill, 1945. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] asked and received unanimous consent that amendments 9 to 14, inclusive, be considered en bloc, and moved that the House insist on its disagreement to those amendments. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] has a motion pending that the House recede and concur.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that I may have the attention of the House for just 2 minutes. The House has just passed, practically unanimously, a bill authorizing $10,000,000 for the study and, I might add, the beginning of a federally supported program for the elimination of tuberculosis in this Nation. Let us remember that the first and basic step in this elimination is the stamping out of bovine tuberculosis. During the past few years we have made great progress in arresting this disease. Much credit is due the veterinarians in our animal-husbandry departments, both State and National.

We have now before us a motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] which, if approved, will increase the salary of a few veterinarians and inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Service. This increase has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The classification has been approved by the Civil Service Commission. It will benefit a group of individuals—3,349, to be exact—that did not have the benefits of increase in pay when other classified employees received higher classifications.

I sincerely hope this committee will vote for this increase. It is only fair, and if it were not for the fact that it has the approval of these groups, I would not be here pleading for it today. We should vote this additional money to a group of individuals who protect the health of our citizens through animal and meat inspection. It is a fair amendment and should be adopted.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. In view of the great importance of the health of the people in peacetimes and the peculiar qualifications of these men who tentatively have been promised this classification, and in view of the necessity of keeping them in the service, is it not simply a matter of economy to recede and concur and grant these classifications as proposed in the Senate amendment?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I share the views just expressed by the gentleman from Texas. It is a matter of economy. The present average pay of these 3,449 officials is $2,573. If we adopt the Senate amendment, and I sincerely believe it should be approved, their average pay will be $2,862, the average increase being $289. The persons affected have been underpaid for many years. They are the lowest paid large professional group in the Department of Agriculture. In the interest of the health and well-being of this Nation I urge you to support the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

(Mr. CARLSON of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, here we are not passing upon just this question as to whether or not these people should be given a raise in pay, we are passing upon the question of whether or not the Classification Act should be amended. If these people are to have an increase in pay, they should be allowed to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from the classification they are in and ask for a change in grade, have it allowed by the Civil Service Commission, as provided in the Classification Act, and then they would be entitled to the money.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I understood that that is what had happened. Am I wrong in that?

Mr. TABER. I did not understand that they had done anything like that. The gentleman from Georgia can tell us about that.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. As I understand, the Civil Service Commission has approved this classification. I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I answer the gentleman from Georgia by saying that the gentleman is right. We have not made provision by way of funds to carry out this classification.

Mr. RAMSPECK. But the Classification Division, acting under the Classification Act, has approved it.

Mr. MASON. Yes; but we have not furnished the funds to do it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The Civil Service Commission has no jurisdiction over the salaries of these field employees. It has submitted some recommendation with reference to the reclassification of such employees, and has done that recently. The statement which has been circulated among the Members of the House by some of the Members with reference to that reclassification having been in effect for years and the Congress having failed to appropriate the money is incorrect.

Mr. TABER. Then there has not been a reclassification of these people?

Mr. TARVER. The Civil Service Commission has no authority by reclassifying field employees to bring about an increase in their salaries.

Mr. TABER. It is a straight operation of a raise on the part of the Congress.

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. TABER. If we do that, we have to go down the line and give a raise to everybody else that comes along.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think we ought to get this straight.

Mr. TABER. I think so.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from Georgia is correct in that the Classification Act does not apply to field employees. Although the Congress has passed an act authorizing the President to extend it to the field service, he has not yet acted under that authority. But I do not think it is fair to say that this is just a raise of salaries, because it is an effort to apply the Classification Act to these employees.

Mr. TABER. This is a case of Congress taking it upon itself to go ahead and grant a raise. If we grant a raise there, we have to grant one all the way down the line, and we cannot stop with any of them. All of them are just as much entitled to a raise as this group. If we are going to do that, there will not be any end to raises as far as the field employees are concerned. I do not think that ought to be done in any such a way. I think we ought not to have a mass raise of salary, and that is what this will result in because these people are not in any different position than the rest of the field employees of the Government. So I hope the motion will not be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion of this proposal a few days ago. It is not my purpose to undertake to repeat the arguments which I undertook to advance on behalf of the conferees at that time. There are, however, many Members of the House now present who were not on the floor at that time.

This is a proposal to increase the salaries of 2,472 employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry beyond the level which was fixed by the Overtime Pay Act of 1943. Under that act these employees received salary increases amounting on the average to $452 per annum per employee.

There is no substantial difference between this proposal and several other salary raise proposals which have been recently rejected. The House on last Friday rejected a proposal for increases in the salaries of the law clerks of the district and circuit Federal judges. The Deficiency Committee in a bill that was brought in and passed by the House on Saturday refused to approve the applications for increases in salary of some two or three other organizations of Government employees.

So far the House has held the line. The House has not embarked upon the policy of raising the salaries of any particular group or groups of Federal employees beyond the levels provided by the Overtime Pay Act of 1943. But if you should adopt the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] and approve this increase of practically a million dollars, $996,000, for the pur-

pose of affording increases which will average about $400 each to all of these field employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, according to simple calculation you will have established a precedent which, in my judgment, will rise to plague you in the not very distant future. I do not see how you can do that and refuse the applications of these various other groups of employees for similar treatment.

Remember that not all of these employees by any means are the professional veterinarian class in whose behalf the appeals have been made strongly to each of the Members of the House through propaganda from throughout the United States and through petitions of lobbyists who have been buttonholing you and me around the Capitol. Only about 800 of these 2,472 employees are veterinarians. The remainder of the employees are unskilled employees. They have had no professional training. Their requirements for qualification from the standpoint of ability are not higher than those of many scores of thousands of other employees in the Federal service. Yet it is proposed here to grant all these employees this very substantial increase, as well as the veterinarians.

The appeal has been very largely based on the idea that these men are going to leave the Government service and desert the important work of meat inspection for our armed forces unless their salaries are raised. It seems to me inconceivable that men who are being paid from $2,000 to $4,800 a year, which is true in the cases of these veterinarians, and who are carrying on very vital and essential work in the war program, and who have had a raise of $452 each on the average during the last year or so, should say, "We are not going to carry on this essential work unless we are given a still further salary increase beyond the increases which have been granted to all types of Federal employees."

As I sought to point out the other day, the men who are in the armed services, who are fighting in France today at $50 a month, cannot quit their work in an effort to secure further compensation from the Federal Government. They are not threatening or desiring to do it. Why should not these men have the same rule applied to them that is sought to be applied by the War Manpower Commission to all other types of labor in the United States? They are trying to keep that labor in occupations where it is most essential, where it is most greatly needed. When men seek to leave an occupation which is regarded as essential in order to transfer to another where they can secure greater compensation they are not permitted to do it unless they get a certificate of availability from the United States Employment Service. But here it is said that these men are going to retire from the work in which they are engaged, willy-nilly, without anybody's consent, and go to other jobs which will pay them more, unless the Congress raises their salaries.

I do not believe they will do it. So far as leaving the Federal service is concerned, I pointed out the other day that in the Social Security Board, out of 10,000 employees, they have lost 6,600 employees. You will find these facts set out in the hearings on the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill. Two thousand five hundred of them were lost to the armed services. They did not secure any salary raise. Four thousand one hundred of them were lost to other jobs where their compensation was greater than they were being paid by the Social Security Board. Now are we going to embark upon a policy of saying that in order to retain these employees in the Federal service we are going to raise everybody's salary to the point where they will be induced to remain in the Government work which they are carrying on? If we are not going to do that, then we had better not adopt this motion of the gentleman from Indiana because the effect of it, as I have said, will be to establish a precedent. It will make it very difficult for us to refuse other demands of like character. I certainly hope that the Congress in the consideration of this matter, despite the personal appeals which have been made to them from their own States, and I know they have been made because they have been made to me, by letters, telegrams, long-distance telephone calls, and lobbyists coming around and interviewing you at your office and elsewhere and urging that this class of employees receive special consideration.

I hope that despite these appeals you may apply the same treatment to these men that you applied to the law clerks in the Federal district and circuit courts, the same treatment that was applied by the Deficiency Committee to two or three different types of Government organizations which came before them seeking salary raises, and that you may say that until Congress considers raising all salary levels in the Federal Government by further legislation, which, in my opinion, ought not to be done, at least not during the period of this war, we are not going to take care of a particular class, notwithstanding the insistency of their appeals. Nothing has happened since you rejected this proposal overwhelmingly when this bill passed the House except the steady, insistent, and selfish lobbying that has been going on. Have you changed your minds on that account?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed by the argument of the gentleman. But the thing that makes me doubt his position is that the Office of Personnel of the Department of Agriculture has felt these men have been improperly and unfairly classified. In connection with this statement, I wish to call attention to a memorandum upon the subject which has been brought to my attention:

From: James B. Burns, national president, American Federation of Government Employees.

Subject: Reclassification of veterinarians and meat inspectors of the Food Distribution Administration and Bureau of Animal Industry.

This memorandum is handed to you at the suggestion of Mr. William C. Hushing, chairman of the legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor.

Under date of March 23, 1944, I telegraphed you, urging that you support the proposal to restore the budget item which was included in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, providing funds for reclassification of the positions of veterinarians and meat inspectors under the Bureau of Animal Industry and Food Distribution Administration.

The effort which was made on the floor of the House to have the item restored resulted in a refusal to restore it by the small vote of 50 to 32.

The matter then went to the Senate. There both the Appropriations Committee and the Senate itself voted unanimously to restore the item. The bill then went to conference, and it is my understanding that at a preliminary meeting of the conferees, with several absentees, an agreement was reached that this matter would remain in disagreement and be reported to the House for further action. It is also my understanding that at a meeting of the conferees held yesterday, a poll of the conferees was not taken because of the previous agreement. The conference report was filed in the House yesterday.

For years these employees have been improperly and unfairly classified, and the proposed reclassification is based on careful studies by the Office of Personnel of the Department of Agriculture, which Department, as well as the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, have fully approved the proposal, because they recognized that years of experience, study, and training have combined to give these employees capability and efficiency that have won world-wide praise; that the food supply of the people must be in safe hands. These employees must be retained on their jobs and meat-inspection positions must be made attractive enough to bring into the service the type of men needed to maintain present standards. As you well know, these inspectors and veterinarians are responsible for safeguarding the quality of meat products shipped to our fighting forces and to our allies, as well as those available for home consumption.

The Department advises that there are many vacancies in this force, which cannot be filled because of the inability of the Department to persuade qualified people and graduates of the different veterinarian colleges to accept positions under their present classification.

All of the above, including the Department's views concerning the necessity for this reclassification is fully set forth in the presentation made to the Senate Appropriations Committee by the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration. Particular reference is made to the communication sent to the Senate committee by War Food Administrator Marvin Jones.

In view of the foregoing, we earnestly and respectfully urge you to support the effort which will be made on the floor of the House to restore this budget item by receding and concurring in the Senate amendment.

JAMES B. BURNS.

Mr. TARVER. The Office of Personnel of the Department of Agriculture has had before them for 10 years and more the question of reclassifying these men in the field service in the Bureau of Animal Industry and they have not done anything about it until within the last few months. Now, reclassification is just a dodge. It is nothing in the world but camouflaged effort to bring about an increase in salary. That is all it

amounts to. If you adopt the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment you are simply voting for an increase in salary amounting to a million dollars a year to one particular group of employees of the Federal Government who have been able to bring pressure to bear upon the Congress to have their salaries raised.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 78, noes 31.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 80, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—255

Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Barrett
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Bloom
Bolton
Bradley, Pa.
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Busbey
Butler
Byrne
Camp
Canfield
Carlson, Kans.
Carrier
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Case
Celler
Chapman
Chenoweth
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, Mo.
Compton
Costello
Cravens
Cunningam
Curley
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Davis
Day
Dilweg
Dingell
Dirksen
Dworshak
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Elsworth
Elston, Ohio
Engle, Calif.
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Fogarty
Gale
Gallagher
Gamble
Gavin
Gearhart
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillespie
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Gordon
Gorski
Gossett
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Green
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Halleck
Hancock
Harness, Ind.
Harris, Ark.
Hart
Hays
Hébert
Hendricks
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Johnson, Anton, J.
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kearney
Keefe
Kelley
Kilday
King
Kinzer
Kirwan
Kleberg
Knutson
Kunkel
LaFollette
Lambertson
Landis
Lanham
Larcade
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lesinski
Ludlow
Lynch
McConnell
McCormack
McCowen
McGehee
McGregor
McKenzie
McWilliams
Maas
Madden
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Michener
Miller, Nebr.
Morrison, La.
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murphy
Murray, Wis.
Myers
Newsome
Norman
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
Outland
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Philbin
Phillips
Pittenger
Poage
Poulson
Pracht, C. Frederick
Pratt, Joseph M.
Price
Ramey
Ramspeck
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Rivers
Rizley
Robinson, Utah
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rolph
Rowan
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Sauthoff
Scanlon
Schiffler
Schwabe
Scott
Scrivner
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sullivan
Talbot
Talle
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolan
Troutman
Vincent, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weaver
Weichel, Ohio
Weiss
Welch
Wene
West
Wickersham
Willey
Wilson
Winter
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NAYS—80

Abernethy
Auchincloss
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barden
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bland
Bonner
Buck
Burch, Va.
Burgin
Clark
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Crawford
Dewey
Dondero
Doughton
Drewry
Durham
Engel, Mich.
Folger
Forand
Gathings
Gore
Graham
Gregory
Hare
Herter
Hoffman
Jeffrey
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.
Kean
Kee
Kerr
McLean
Mahon
Maloney
May
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Pa.
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Murray, Tenn.
Norrell
O'Konski
O'Neal
Pace
Ploeser
Powers
Priest
Randolph
Robertson
Robsion, Ky.
Rohrbough
Russell
Satterfield
Smith, Ohio
Smith, W. Va.
Stigler
Sumner, Ill.
Sundstrom
Taber
Tarver
Taylor
Vinson, Ga.
Vorys, Ohio
Walter
Ward
Waslelewski
White
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Winstead
Wolcott
Woodrum, Va.

NOT VOTING—95

Arnold
Bell
Blackney
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Brumbaugh
Buckley
Burchill, N. Y.
Burdick
Cannon, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.
Capozzoli
Chiperfield
Cole, N. Y.
Cox
Crosser
Dawson
Delaney
Dickstein
Dies
Disney
Douglas
Eaton
Elmer
Fay
Fish
Ford
Fulbright
Fuller
Fulmer
Furlong
Gibson
Gifford
Granger
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Harless, Ariz.
Harris, Va.
Hartley
Heffernan
Heidinger
Jensen
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Luther A.
Kefauver
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilburn
Klein
Lane
Lea
Lemke
Lewis
Luce
McCord
McMillan
McMurray
Magnuson
Mansfield, Tex.
Merritt
Merrow
Miller, Mo.
Mills
Morrison, N. C.
Murdock
Norton
O'Connor
O'Toole
Patman
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Plumley
Rabaut
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Richards
Rooney
Rowe
Shafer
Sheridan
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Va.
Somers, N. Y.
Stearns, N. H.
Stewart
Sumners, Tex.
Thomas, N. J.
Torrens
Towe
Treadway
Whelchel, Ga.
Whitten

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. O'Connor for, with Mr. Miller of Missouri against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Whitten against.

General pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Mills with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Towe.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Burdick.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: Page 29, line 2, after "639", insert the following: "of which (notwithstanding the above limitation upon buildings) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the construction of a building at the Houma (La.) station."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 17.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at a point just before the roll call vote on the first amendment and include therein a statement from the American Federation of Government Employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 25, line 38, strike out "258,470" and insert in lieu thereof "$283,470."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 25.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOLMES of Washington moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 25.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I make this preferential motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment raising the appropriation for the eradication of barberry from $258,470 to $283,470.

I make this preferential motion on the basis that there is a heavy infestation of barberry in the eastern section of the State of Washington, one of the greatest wheat-growing sections of the United States.

Barberry comes into this picture in a very important way because it acts as a host plant for the creation and growth of spore of the fungi that causes black stem rust in wheat. In the present Federal program there are already 17 States included. We are asking for this money to bring the State of Washington into the program. These spores are windborne. They respect no geographic boundaries. They are spreading rapidly.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. How much acreage is there in Washington in this affected area?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Several hundred thousand acres of wheat are located in this affected area. One county alone this last year lost anywhere from 140,000 to 200,000 bushels of wheat. We have lost in eastern Washington, throughout the Palouse country in the past 5 years, through the infestation of black-stem rust, more than a million bushels.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might say to the gentleman that this barberry eradication should go in all spring wheat areas as well as the areas to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, because out in our State, if we would start this particular program now, we would not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, how much does the gentleman estimate would be saved in production in bushels of wheat if he gets this small item he is asking for?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. It would contribute to the saving of at least 300,000 bushels of wheat annually in the eastern section of the State. I think that the wisdom of granting this $25,000 increase to the appropriation would be a piece of money that would be very well spent in view of the food program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I understand that this is a cooperative program in which the States contribute a certain amount. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the State of Washington is prepared and ready to contribute its quota to match this $25,000 requested here?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. The director of agriculture, Mr. Arthur Cox, wired in that the State of Washington is in a position to appropriate matching funds for this $25,000 appropriation and to carry it out along with the other States that are in this program to further the eradication of barberry infestation in that section of the State.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has always made provision for programs of this type in general terms applicable to the country as a whole. We have the Dutch elm disease eradication program. We have numerous other programs for the eradication of various pests throughout the country. But this is the first time, so far as I have observed, where the Senate has added an appropriation for one particular county in one particular State. This appropriation of $25,000, in addition to the Budget estimate, you may observe from the report of the Senate committee, is intended for application in Whitman County, Wash.

It seemed to our subcommittee that it would be an extremely bad precedent to begin making appropriations for particular counties in a program of this sort. We may reasonably anticipate if we do this that there will be a great number of counties in various parts of the United States that will come in and ask for special appropriations for their counties only.

We gave the full Budget estimate for barberry eradication; every dollar that the Budget said was necessary to carry on the national program. That money is available for use in Whitman County, Wash., just as it is available for use in any county in Idaho or Montana or anywhere else where the barberry pest may flourish. It seems to us that it would be an extremely bad precedent to undertake to deal with one specific county in a particular State and say that as to that particular county we would go $25,000 above the Budget and direct that that expenditure be made in Whitman County, Wash.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. The reason the gentleman mentions Whitman County in the State of Washington is that that county was named as having the highest degree of infestation in the eastern part of the State.

Mr. TARVER. No. The Senate committee said that $25,000 was intended for expenditure in Whitman County. The gentleman did not present this matter to the department and request that it be presented to the Budget. That of course is the regular procedure. If there is an emergency condition in the county of Whitman in the State of Washington, it ought to have special consideration. The gentleman may still present the facts to the Budget, and, if justified, an estimate can be procured and sent over to deal with the situation before the season for the eradication of barberry in the early part of next year begins. I trust the gentleman will pardon me for quoting him. I am sure he will recall his statement to me this morning, that the reason he had not presented it to the Budget and had not requested the department to present the matter to the Budget for consideration was that his State had only decided some 2 or 3 weeks ago that it would match the appropriation if made. That is right, is it not?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Partially. The State some time before that had made the arrangements for the matching of the funds; I will admit not at the time I appeared at the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman explained to me the failure to present it to the Budget by saying that the State had decided only some 2 or 3 weeks ago to match the money. Is not that right?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I did not say that the State had decided only 2 or 3 weeks ago to match the money.

Mr. TARVER. When did the State decide it?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. It was in the interim between my appearance before the House committee and my appearance before the Senate committee.

Mr. TARVER. That was only some short while ago.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. About 2 months ago.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. So, if there has been a failure to present the matter through the regular channels to the Budget, that failure has been occasioned by the failure of the State of Washington to take action in the matter itself. The gentleman can now go to the Department and ask the Department to go to the Budget and ask that it send over a special estimate, if one be necessary in its judgment, for the special work desired in Whitman County, Wash.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think in fairness to the gentleman from Washington it ought to be said that the Department of Agriculture when commenting on the Senate increase said that this was an infested area, that there was a real menace to wheat culture at the present time.

Mr. TARVER. There is no question about that. The Department can use any part of this money which is carried in the bill, $258,000 plus, that they want to in Whitman County, Wash. There is no reason why they should not do it. Here we are asked to appropriate one-tenth as much money for Whitman County, Wash., as is made available by the bill to the entire 17 States, I think it is, in the United States where the barberry pest exists. It seems to me that would be an exceedingly bad precedent to set.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I call the attention of the gentleman to the statement of the Department of Agriculture at the House hearing that the two-hundred-and-fifty-eight-thousand-odd dollars was not sufficient to expand the program to additional geographical territories.

Mr. TARVER. Yet they have a perfect right to use any part of that money they may desire in that territory, and they have the right to go to the Budget and ask for more money. We gave them all they said they wanted.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The State of Washington was not in that list of 17 States that have this eradication program. Would the committee accept a deficiency appropriation request later on?

Mr. TARVER. My committee does not handle deficiency appropriations, but, as I say, all Budget requests for dealing with this pest have been granted heretofore. If the gentleman from Washington and his colleague will go through the regular course and present the matter to the Budget, I think they may be assured of a sympathetic hearing according to their needs.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that this $258,000 is allocated to the various States which had prior to the time of the submission of the Budget estimate arranged to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture, and that a new State coming in with an emergency situation, unprepared to contribute, would be out of luck? That is the picture that is presented.

Mr. TARVER. No, it is not allocated to any particular State or section by law. If it has been allocated by the Department, the Department has a perfect right to change its allocations. There is nothing obligatory in the allocations which have been made by the Department.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is possible that the Members of the House may be interested in the administration of this fund—in the Department's procedure in the eradication of this pest, the modus operandi, as reported at first hand by a farmer in my State. This farmer, who owns a farm in northern Missouri, reports on the method of handling this work, and incidentally the method of spending the money which we are appropriating for this purpose, as follows: He said that one day a Government man drove up in an automobile and introduced himself as an employee of the United States Department of Agriculture engaged in the eradication of barberry. He asked if the farmer had any barberry on his farm. The farmer replied that he believed there was a bush up in the west pasture and directed him to the field. The Government man went up and found it and looked it over. The farmer took for granted that as he was engaged in barberry eradication and this was a small bush, he would dig it up. But he took no action except to make a notation in a book he carried and got in his automobile, and drove away.

The farmer had forgotten about the matter until about 2 weeks later when a pick-up truck drove up with a driver and two other men and told him they had a report that there was a barberry bush on his farm and they had come to dispose of it. The farmer was by this time so interested in the bush that had caused so much attention that he walked up through the pasture and showed them the bush, supposing they would dig it up this time and get rid of it. But they had brought along a bag of salt and salted the bush and wrote down some kind of a report and got back in the truck and drove away. The treatment was effective. At least the bush died, the farmer was certain he had heard the last of his now famous barberry bush.

But about a month later another Government man drove into his place and said he understood a barberry bush had been destroyed on the farm, and he was there to check up on it. He directed the man up to the pasture, and presently he came back and said yes, the bush had been destroyed, and sat down on a bench under the shade of a tree in the yard and wrote out a report and then got in his automobile and drove away. When asked if the bush had ever done any damage the farmer said he did not know; that he had never heard of it doing any damage, but it was certainly dead now and had been written up three times.

It took five men, two automobiles, and one pick-up truck, and an unestimated amount of Government money to get that one bush, and with highly problematical advantages, if any, although the farmer seemed to be much impressed with the efficiency of the Department of Agriculture. As he said, when they did anything, they did it right.

I received a letter last year from a constituent who wrote that he had been up in Montana to visit a cousin who lived up there. He wrote that his cousin had a wonderful job with the Government driving over the country looking for barberry bushes. He wanted me to get him the same kind of a job. He said it was a grand job, as all his cousin had to do was drive around and look for barberry bushes, and the Government paid his expenses and a good salary. He was so certain that I could get him a job like that which would permit him to quit farm work and take to the road, that it was with real regret that I had to write and disillusion him.

All the men who hold these jobs, and the office men who direct them, seem to be strongly in favor of large appropriations for this purpose, and, in view of their enthusiasm, it is to be regretted that conditions and results secured do not warrant increased appropriations for the purpose. We have a war on our hands and our funds for local and nonmilitary purposes are more limited than they were when this campaign was undertaken some 8 or 10 years ago. We have the greatest public debt in the history of this or any other country Every dollar of the money provided by this amendment must be borrowed and adds to that debt. It must be taken out of the money we are asking the people to pay for bonds in the Fifth War Loan drive. I am a farmer and I favor every legitimate farm appropriation that will help win the war. But such an appropriation as this is absolutely unjustifiable from any point of view.

After years of study of the situation on the part of the committee there is no ground on which to base a belief that the expenditure of this additional money will add a bushel of wheat to next year's crop. But even if it did it is inexpedient at this time. Happily, there is no prospect of a shortage in wheat production. We had a report from the Department of Agriculture last week estimating a wheat crop for 1944 in excess of 1,000,000,000 bushels. We are growing the greatest crop of wheat this year ever produced in the United States. Under the circumstances, with the greatest wheat supply in prospect ever produced, and the war nearing its concluding phase, I cannot conceive of anyone asking the House to override the committee in its carefully considered opposition to the expenditure of further funds for such a purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is an astonishing proposal. It is for a single county in the United States, an unheard of appropriation. It is extravagance and waste pure and simple. There is no Budget estimate for it. The entire committee and the subcommittee which has studied this subject for years reported against it unanimously. No agronomist will testify that its expenditure will produce a single additional bushel of wheat during the war. We are already so deep in dept it will take generations to pay us out, and we are borrowing money from every conceivable source to support our expenditure of $7,000,000,000 a month to win the war. I trust the House will support the committee against all such unprecedented, unwarranted, and untenable expenditures.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLMES of Washington) there were—ayes 93, noes 71.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground no quorum is present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 132, not voting 110, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—188

Allen, Ill.	Angell	Bender
Andersen, H. Carl	Arends	Bennett, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Auchincloss	Bennett, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bishop
	Barrett	Bolton
	Beall	Brehm

Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Busbey
Butler
Canfield
Carlson, Kans.
Carrier
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Case
Chapman
Chenoweth
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Coffee
Cole, Mo.
Compton
Cunningham
Curtis
Day
Dewey
Dilweg
Dingell
Dirksen
Dworshak
Elliott
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Ellsworth
Elston, Ohio
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Fellows
Fenton
Fish
Gale
Gallagher
Gamble
Gavin
Gearhart
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillespie
Gillette
Gillie
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Hancock
Harness, Ind.
Hart
Hendricks
Herter
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Johnson, Anton J.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Ward
Jonkman
Judd
Kearney
Keefe
King
Kinzer
Kirwan
Kleberg
Knutson
LaFollette
Landis
Larcade
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lesinski
McConnell
McCowen
McGregor
McKenzie
McWilliams
Maas
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Michener
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Morrison, La.
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Norman
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
O'Konski
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Phillips
Pittenger
Poulson
Powers
Pratt, Joseph M.
Price
Ramey
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Rivers
Rizley
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rolph
Sauthoff
Schiffler
Schwabe
Scott
Scrivner
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Sparkman
Springer
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sumner, Ill.
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tibbott
Troutman
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Wasielewski
Welchel, Ohio
West
White
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Willey
Wilson
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—132

Abernethy
Allen, La.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Andrews, Ala.
Baldwin, Md.
Barden
Barry
Bates, Mass.
Beckworth
Bland
Bloom
Bonner
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Bulwinkle
Burch, Va.
Burgin
Camp
Cannon, Mo.
Celler
Clark
Cochran
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Curley
D'Alesandro
Drewry
Durham
Eberharter
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Folger
Forand
Gathings
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Green
Gregory
Hare
Harris, Ark.
Hays
Hébert
Hobbs
Hoch
Holifield
Jarman
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones
Kean
Kee
Kelley
Kerr
Kilday
Kunkel
Lambertson
Lanham
Ludlow
McCormack
McGehee
McLean
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
May
Miller, Conn.
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Myers
Newsome
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neal
Outland
Philbin
Ploeser
Poage
Priest
Ramspeck
Randolph
Robertson
Rohrbough
Rowan
Russell
Sadowski
Sasscer
Satterfield
Scanlon
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Smith, W. Va.
Spence
Stigler
Sullivan
Sumners, Tex.
Sundstrom
Tarver
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tolan
Vincent, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Ward
Weaver
Weiss
Wene
Whittington
Winstead
Woodrum, Va.
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—110

Andrews, N. Y.
Arnold
Bates, Ky.
Bell
Blackney
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Brumbaugh
Buckley
Burchill, N. Y.
Burdick
Byrne
Cannon, Fla.
Capozzoli
Chiperfield
Cole, N. Y.
Crosser
Davis
Dawson
Delaney
Dickstein
Dies
Disney
Dondero
Doughton
Douglas
Eaton
Elmer
Fay
Fogarty
Ford
Fulbright
Fuller
Fulmer
Furlong
Gibson
Gifford
Goodwin
Granger
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Harless, Ariz.
Harris, Va.
Hartley
Heffernan
Heidinger
Jensen
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Luther A.
Kefauver
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilburn
Klein
Lane
Lea
Lemke
Lewis
Luce
Lynch
McCord
McMurray
Magnuson
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
Merritt
Merrow
Miller, Mo.
Mills
Morrison, N. C.
Murdock
Norton
O'Connor
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Plumley
Pracht, C. Frederick
Rabaut
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Richards
Robinson, Utah
Rooney
Rowe
Sabath
Shafer
Sheridan
Sikes
Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter
Smith, Va.
Somers, N. Y.
Stearns, N. H.
Stewart
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Torrens
Towe
Treadway
Vinson, Ga.
Welch
Whelchel, Ga.
Whitten

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Peterson of Georgia against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. McMurray against.

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Lane against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Byrne against.

Mr. Calvin Johnson for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Dickstein against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Rowe for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Lynch against.

General pairs:

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. C. Frederick Pracht.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Hagen.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House may sit during the sessions of the House on tomorrow and the day following. In explanation of this request, may I say that we have two or three small bills which the war Department is urging to be considered before recess. We are not quite through the hearings. It is my purpose to sit while the House is in session for just a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. Usually objection has been made to committees sitting while bills are being read for amendment or while conference reports are being considered by the House. But the Chair will put the gentleman's request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the statement made by the Speaker, which represents the policy of the House, may I ask the gentleman if he will amend his request and ask that the committee may sit while general debate on any bill is going on in Committee of the Whole? That would be more agreeable and would conserve the practice that has been consistently adhered to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to do that except for one thing. The committee is called to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and the House will meet at the same hour. I am hopeful that we can get through with General White's testimony in about 15 minutes. If I should agree that the committee would sit only during general debate that might not take place on a bill for an hour and a half after we met.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are reasons why we have this practice which has been strictly adhered to that no committee be given permission to sit while the House is considering a bill in the amendment stage or while a conference report is before the House. There are sound, practical reasons why that practice exists and has been strictly adhered to. Could not the committee meet at 9:30?

Mr. MAY. The members have been notified that the committee will meet at 10 o'clock, in the belief that we would have an hour before the House met. I may say to the gentleman that if my request is not granted, and even if it is, it may happen that the bills will have to go over until after the recess. One of them is vitally important in the respect that General White is urging it as a morale builder for the infantry forces on the battle front.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that the gentleman did not know that the House was going to meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock when he made arrangements for his committee meeting. We are hopeful, however, that we will be able to dispose of all business and take a recess the latter part of the week. I do not want to agree to anything which will constitute a precedent. I have no objection, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and it is not to be considered as a precedent. Would not the gentleman modify his unanimous consent request for the committee to sit between 10 and 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. MAY. I will agree to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want that to be considered as a precedent for the future insofar as unanimous-consent

requests may be made for committees to sit while the House is considering a bill in its important stages, or a conference report.

Mr. MAY. Personally, I do not want to be captious or contentious. I will modify my request that the committee may sit between 10 and 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted the ranking minority member of that committee?

Mr. MAY. No; I have not been able to find him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has not consulted any of the minority members of the committee?

Mr. MAY. No. There are several of them present. If any one of them objects, I shall withdraw the request.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I can permit the request to go through under the circumstances.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, further insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 10, and agree to a further conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. RABAUT, KERR, HARE, O'BRIEN of Illinois, CARTER, STEFAN, and JONES.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 42, line 15, strike out "at a total cost not to exceed $15,000" and insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building in a fiscal year shall not exceed $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ":*Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 25, after the word "Columbia" insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary may authorize expenditures not to exceed $1,000,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 40 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the fourth line of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment before the word "critical" insert the word "extremely."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that consideration of Senate amendment 41 be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 59, line 18, after the figures "$200,000; insert upon authorization or approval of the War Food Administrator, travel expenses to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations not to exceed $20,000, including travel in privately owned automobiles of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 43.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 62, line 10, after the parentheses, insert "; and the method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this proviso: *Provided further*."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 48.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 64, line 5, after the word "inclusive", insert ", and, in addition, $12,500,000 for making additional payments on an acreage and pound basis for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes determined by the War Food Administrator to be necessary for an adequate supply of such seeds."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 52.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 64, line 9, after the word "Provided" strike out down to and including the word "further" in line 17, as follows: "That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1944 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated February 9, 1944."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 53 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tarver moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

"Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"'That, excepting the foregoing item of $12,500,000, no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided further*.'"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 67, line 5, after the word "producers" insert "*Provided further*, That the War Food Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 agricultural conservation program with respect to any farm if the War Food Administration determines that the producer would have been eligible for such payments except for the failure of such producer, because of negligence of an officer or agent of the Federal Government, to file on or before June 30, 1943, Form ACP-140, and such payments shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774)."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 59.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that consideration of Senate amendment No. 60 be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 72, line 22, insert the following:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"To enable the Secretary to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32 in a sum not exceeding $50,000,000: *Provided,* That such funds shall be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1945 without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 63 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"Not exceeding $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further,* That benefits under this section to schools or child-care centers shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school or child-care center as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further,* That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in this section: *Provided further,* That not more than 2 percent of the funds made available under this amendment shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds used in any State during any fiscal year under this paragraph shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the State and local school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers or agencies having control thereof."

Mr. TARVER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the language is practically the same as that contained in the Pace bill, H. R. 4278, relating to the school-lunch program, as amended by the House on June 1, 1944, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 79, line 22, insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws, (2) loans to needy individual farmers, (3) grants, and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $28,265,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $57,000 for compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided,* That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under his supervision, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

"In making any grant payments under this act the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $96,710,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at not to exceed the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion, or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agricultural commodities.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation, shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1945 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 65 with an amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, that amendment is highly controversial.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman thinks it is controversial, I should be glad to ask unanimous consent that it be passed over.

Mr. TABER. I think the next one is also controversial.

Mr. TARVER. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps we had better desist from further efforts today and take these matters up tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if I may take just a minute to remind the House, tomorrow, when action on this conference report is resumed, we will take up the guayule amendment, and the Farm Security, Farm Tenant, and Farm Utilities amendments; is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I think that is correct.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, since only 1 hour will be alloted to debate on the WASP bill I think that Members of this House are entitled to know the real facts concerning the controversy between the WASPS and the C. A. A.-W. T. S. programs. Every man that was taken in the C. P. T.-C. A. A.-W. T. S. program was given the understanding that he would receive a commission in the Army Air Forces. Whereas most of these promises were made by the C. A. A., the Army acquiesced in them and these men at considerable self-sacrifice trained and instructed thousands of the flyers who are now being decorated for their outstanding acts of bravery in combat zones all over the world. Had these men chosen some other branch of the armed forces at the time they started in this program, all would be officers today with the rank of lieutenant up. Many were offered commissions in the Navy.

A. A. F. officials say the Air Force is now large enough and instead of the Army Air Forces taking these men in, the A. A. F. has decided to let these thousands go into the walking army and thereby lose the value of the skill and experience of these men who have anywhere from 200 hours to 4,000 hours of flying time. Instead of utilizing these men, which number approximately 7,500, the A. A. F. plan to spend $100,000,000 in the training of 5,000 WASPS, who when finished will not be able to perform as many services of flying in the Air Forces as the C. A. A.-W. T. S. instructors and trainees can do at this time, or could do with very little additional training. In other words, it is a duplication that will cost the taxpayers over $100,000,000.

The WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and MARINES were given military status by Congress, who authorized their mobilization. However, 1,000 WASPS are in the process of being trained without any authorization from Congress. It has been a glamorous but unnecessary duplication and many men with ability have been sitting idle for weeks, while some with 1,000 hours or more are existing on unemployment insurance.

The Army is very concerned for some reason about this WASP program. Miss Cochran recently stated, "If the war lasts long enough we will probably use women pilots for noncombat duties in some theaters of war." Not that those in the WASP program are not sincere and patriotic, because the girls really think there is a job for them to do and most of them are very conscientious about it.

The program for women flyers as originally started by the WAFS, where approximately 100 of the finest women flyers in America were utilized for ferrying, did a wonderful job. These were experienced and the cream of the crop, having 500 hours or more of flying time. At one time General Arnold made the statement, "I am not going to gum up the Air Forces with 200 women pilots." But evidently he has done an about face as he is now pressing for the mobilization of not 200 women flyers but 5,000. The flying requirements for women when the program was first started was 500 hours and this has gradually been dropped until today the WASPS have as their requirement only 35 hours of either solo or dual time, with age limit from 18½ years to 35. The WASPS are perhaps the most super-duper and glamorous of all programs. Magazines have played them up and even the movies contributed a picture in their behalf. Their natty and stylish uniforms were tailored on Fifth Avenue in New York and cost over $500 for each WASP. Not long ago several news writers traveled to Camp Davis, N. C., to see the WASPS at work towing targets for anti-aircraft forces. Two girls, one of whom burned to death, were killed at this work.

There is absolutely no need for girl pilots in the Army at this time and there are thousands of men pilots at this moment unacceptable for combat who are begging for an opportunity to fly in the ferry command. When one of the WASPS were told they were to receive a commission as major, she promptly said, "Not me. What would my brother think who is bombing Berlin each night? He is only a lieutenant and yet you are trying to make me a major. I prefer not to have the commission."

At one flying field some of the officers of the A. A. F. always cracked a smile whenever a WASP's name was called for flying and they refused to take more than five WASPS in this airport, giving as their reason that they were oversupplied.

If the WASPS themselves knew the situation as it actually exists there would be no more WASP program. Only 30 percent of the WASPS want to be actually militarized, but here is the catch—when they were questioned by the A. A. F. they were given the choice of being militarized or resign, so naturally they were forced to agree to militarization and the Army assumes therefore that 93 percent want militarization. One WASP is quoted as saying that Jacqueline Cochran openly brags that she has General Arnold behind her in anything she wants as far as the WASPS are concerned. There are at least 10,000 C. A. A.-W. T. S. pilots who would require little or no training to do any kind of ferry work. Today many of the W. T. S. trainees are peeling potatoes in the Regular Army and some are existing on unemployment insurance.

At present the WASPS have two fears, both of them are very hush-hush. One, that they will be militarized, and the other that they will be forced to work as instructors. That is the one great fear and the one thing that the WASPS would despise the most; as one WASP put it—there is no glamour sitting in a plane for 6 hours a day trying to teach some inexperienced kid how to fly a ship. However, women instructors like Irene Crum with 2,500 hours, Ruth Chalmers with 3,500 hours, and Dot Lemon with 5,000 hours, who are as skilled as any women pilots in the world, have done a great job in instructing and training men pilots.

One thing unusual about the WASP is that unlike the WAVES or WAC's there is no noncommissioned personnel and it is understood that the WASP is to be an elite corps with no privates, no corporals, and no sergeants. It is very unusual that the Army should train civilian employees as there has been no legal authority given the A. A. F. for the training of these WASPS. The reason given is the fact that the high command of the A. A. F. consider the WASPS as professionals and the comparison has been made to such professional people as doctors who require 7 years of schooling, nurses who require 4 years of training, and WASPS by comparison who require only 27 weeks.

There is a ruling that no woman is eligible to join the WAC if she has any children under 18, yet there is no provision in this connection as far as the WASPS are concerned. If a WASP washes out 2 weeks before graduation she is a complete loss. However, if a WAC does not get a commission she goes back to her place as a sergeant, corporal, or private and her use to the armed service is continued. The area in which the WASPS can serve has never been defined. General Arnold in his testimony before the Military Affairs Committee of the House stated:

> We haven't as yet sent any women in active combat theater and there is no intention that we will.

However, the Secretary of War in a letter to the Comptroller General stated:

> It is also contemplated that the (WASP) services may be required in foreign countries in the near future.

Perhaps the irony of the whole WASP program is that many instructors of the W. T. S. program with 2,000 hours or

the language dealing with the Committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean I shall vote against the appropriation. So, Mr. President, I shall vote to strike out of the bill the proposal with respect to the Committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Cordon	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Ferguson	Murray	Weeks
George	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Gerry	Overton	White
Gillette	Pepper	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] proposing to strike out the paragraph relating to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, as amended, being lines 3 to 16, inclusive, on page 10.

Mr. BALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] who, if present, would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who, if present, would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). I have been requested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to announce that he is unavoidably absent on Federal business, and that if present he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

I also announce the following pairs: the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]; the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]; and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] would vote "yea," and the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]; and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Virgina [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent. These Senators would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent attending the marriage of his daughter. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bankhead	George	Maybank
Bilbo	Gurney	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bushfield	Holman	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Connally	McClellan	Stewart
Eastland	McKellar	White

NAYS—38

Aiken	Kilgore	Taft
Ball	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Maloney	Tunnell
Capper	Mead	Vandenberg
Chavez	Murdock	Wagner
Cordon	Murray	Wallgren
Davis	O'Mahoney	Walsh, Mass.
Ferguson	Pepper	Walsh, N. J.
Gerry	Radcliffe	Weeks
Gillette	Reed	Wherry
Guffey	Revercomb	Willis
Hatch	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—37

Andrews	Downey	O'Daniel
Austin	Ellender	Reynolds
Bailey	Glass	Scrugham
Bone	Green	Smith
Bridges	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Hayden	Tobey
Buck	Jackson	Truman
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Caraway	La Follette	Wheeler
Chandler	Langer	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wilson
Clark, Mo.	Moore	
Danaher	Nye	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 31, 41, 43, 48, 52, 59, 66, and 71 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 40, 53, and 63 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 to the bill and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 to the bill, asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers

on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 1475. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service;

H. R. 4659. An act to authorize the Soil Conservation Service to lend certain equipment; and

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution making appropriations for grants to States under the Social Security Act.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, at the end of line 16, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any complaint against any defendant where such defendant does not have the same right to appeal an adverse decision of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to the President of the United States, or to refer said complaint to the President of the United States for final disposition, as is asserted by or allowed the said Committee on Fair Employment Practice in cases where persons complained against refuse to abide by its orders."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the nature of this agency is transformed by the vote which has just been taken. Heretofore the organization has been the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice. By the majority vote which has just been had in this Chamber it now becomes the Congress' Committee on Fair Employment Practice. Up until this hour it has been the child of the executive branch of Government. The legislative branch has now adopted it, and has undertaken to give it legality.

Certainly, Mr. President, if we are going to confirm in this manner all the acts of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice and all the rules and all the regulations which have been promulgated by it, the least we can do is to preserve an essential right of every American citizen, namely, the right to appeal from an adverse decision which may destroy such citizen.

Under the regulations which now are in force, which provide for the procedure in the Committee, the Committee has the right to refer or to cite to the President of the United States any defendant who refuses to carry out its orders. The amendment merely would allow a defendant who has been cited before the Committee—without, as I still insist, any authority of law—to have the same right of appeal which is allowed to the Committee.

Of course, Senators can vote against providing any right of appeal. They can vote to give the Committee all the powers it has asserted are vested in it by the Executive order. But I shall ask that we have a yea-and-nay vote on the question whether an individual who has been cited before the Committee shall be denied the right of appeal, shall have his contracts canceled, and shall have other sanctions imposed against him, although the Committee itself, if that person refuses to act, has a right to appeal to the President of the United States.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which provides that right.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to have a clear understanding of the amendment, before the vote is taken. The Committee on Fair Employment Practice has no right to cancel contracts. The Senator has said contracts can be canceled only through some other agency of Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator contend that if the War Department cancels a contract, the man who had the contract has a right to appeal to the President of the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I am seeking. I say that if the War Department is to cancel a man's contract because he does not conform to a ruling or order which has been issued by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, certainly that man, the defendant, should have the right to appeal.

Under the procedure which now obtains, the Executive order provides that if a person refuses to conform, before sanctions are employed the Committee has a right to cite the defendant to the President of the United States. In two cases the Committee has cited defendants to the President.

The amendment provides that if the Committee arbitrarily and without good reason proposes to cancel a contract, a party to the contract shall have a right to appeal.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am inclined to be in accord with what I think is the Senator's purpose. But I am wondering whether by the amendment he would not direct that a party to almost any canceled war contract might have the right to appeal to the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so. The amendment provides that if the committee arbitrarily attempts to impose some unfair order or regulation upon a party to such a contract, he may have the right of appeal to the President. At the present time such a person is absolutely without any recourse. He cannot go into the courts. Of course, it would be a futile thing to give him the right to come to the Congress, inasmuch as the Congress has already vested these powers in the Committee on Employment by the vote just had. There should be a right of appeal somewhere before a citizen suffers loss due to arbitrary action.

As I have said before, the matter of the cancelation of contracts is a question of life and death with American business today. The Committee on Fair Employment Practice, having been given congressional sanction, can practically eliminate an industry if it wishes to do so, and a party to a contract has absolutely no right of appeal from the Committee's decision.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator think his amendment makes it clear that persons engaged in war work, and subject to the cancelation of contracts, can appeal only if the difficulty arises as the result of action taken by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. Such persons could appeal only when a government department or agency has canceled a contract, and when the party to the canceled contract, or the defendant, contends that some action on the part of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice has been arbitrarily directed against him.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has made that point clear; has he?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure it is clear. Of course, the effect of the amendment is that some rules to provide for an appeal must be established. That is its effect. The only way we can bring that about is by way of a limitation upon the appropriation. With this limitation imposed I am sure the F. E. P. C. will provide some method of appeal to those who contest its powers and orders.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the present practice, as I understand it, if a person or corporation proceeded against refuses to carry out an order of the Committee, the Committee may appeal to the President. Is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Committee itself cannot cancel contracts, and does not do so, under the regulations. But the War Department or some other department which has a contract may do so, as I understand the situation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the department which has the contract which has been recommended for cancelation by the Committee—I suppose the Committee can do that—itself refuses to cancel the contract, then the Committee can take that matter to the President; is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator is seeking to accomplish, as I understand the amendment, is that when the department involved has canceled the contract, a party to the contract can appeal to the President, if the department canceled the contract as a result of a recommendation of the Committee, but not of any other agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

governors of the States to submit to the President not only the names of those to serve on the Selective Service boards, but the names of those who volunteered in war work, the governors did so. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I had no idea of suggesting an amendment which would in any way reflect on the service to this country in time of war of any individual, and I know that the majority leader did not mean to infer that my amendment would do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I did not mean that. The point is, why deny people, who are willing an opportunity to serve in connection with the committee now under discussion, any American who is willing to serve without compensation, when we are not taking such action as to any other activity?

Mr. MAYBANK. Very frankly, the general police powers of this country and of any State, as the Senator knows, are entirely different from those affecting volunteers on ration boards or in the selective service. While I am not asking for a yea and nay vote, I am conscientious in believing that the United States Government has sufficient money to pay those who are supposed to go around and look into complaints of some businessman, or someone else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. One moment, Mr. President. The majority leader brought up the subject of the volunteer work being done by the people of this country, and I am happy he did so. I want to have the record clear. My thought in connection with this is that where investigations under this Committee with police power are ordered, a committee for which $500,000 is appropriated, they should be undertaken by paid workers or those who have taken the oath of office. We need volunteers to assist in the war effort, but to turn the police powers of the Government of the United States over to individuals who have not taken the oath of office, and who are responsible to no one except some member of the Fair Employment Practice Committee who may appoint them, is a mistake.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to delay a vote. I merely raised the question because it seems to me a little unusual that, inasmuch as in all the other agencies, the people are permitted to render service without charging for it, we should make it impossible for anyone to render service in connection with the agency under discussion without paying them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may move to reconsider the vote by which an item was agreed to, and I should like leave to make a brief explanation. It pertains to the appropriation for Federal and State cooperation through the Office of Civilian Defense.

The House of Representatives reduced the appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense from $4,700,000 for the year 1944 to $1,000,000 for the year 1945. However, the House committee stated in its report, on page 11, as follows:

> In making the decrease of $139,000 in the Budget estimates, the committee feels that it has provided the irreducible minimum for a Federal program of leadership in civilian defense considering the lessened danger of attack, but viewing the home-front activities which are carried on by State and local councils and their contribution to the war effort. All danger of coastal attack of some character is not definitely past, and those regions are entitled to and should continue to receive attention.

Mr. President, as I have said, in this item the House of Representatives provided $538,500 for the Federal-State cooperation program for civilian defense. That is a part of the civilian-defense activity in which the volunteer work of all citizens is coordinated through State and local councils by the Federal Government, through the Office of Civilian Defense.

As I have said, the House of Representatives cut $100,000 from a Budget estimate of $638,000, but the House committee said, in making the cut, that that was, in its opinion, the irreducible minimum, in fairness to the public interest being served by this agency.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations took action, which has been ratified already by the Senate, cutting another 25 percent off the appropriation, bringing it down to $403,000. I know that the officials of the Civilian Defense Agency, and persons from several States, have contacted a number of Senators, and it is felt that a grave injustice will be done to this volunteer program, which embraces 11,000 local councils and 11,000,000 citizen volunteers working through the program.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the figure $403,875, which is the committee amendment, was agreed to, on page 9, line 18, of the pending bill, so that we may have a vote, not a record vote, but a vote, on whether the Senate would like to concur in the House item, which the House said provided the irreducible minimum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not object to the Senator's request to reconsider the vote, but I appeal to the Senate in this matter not to vote these sums back into this appropriation bill.

The House allowed a million dollars, in all, for the Office of Civilian Defense. We all know what that is. There is not one one-thousandth of the danger there was when this organization was started. We have gradually reduced the appropriation from year to year, as the danger has passed. At present we are not doing much more than keeping the skeleton of the organization, and retaining some people in office. The committee thought a reduction from a million dollars to $750,000 was a very modest cut.

I do not think there was a member of the committee who did not agree respecting the several amendments aggregating $250,000. I am willing that the Senator from Florida shall have unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted, but when a vote is taken on the question I beseech the Senate not to provide for $250,000 additional to be spent absolutely uselessly. As a matter of fact, I think the amount of $750,000 provided for the Office of Civilian Defense is too much.

Mr. REED. It is too much; yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. But if there is any evidence that can be brought forth to justify that amount it can be brought to the attention of the conferees.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. I join with the Senator from Tennessee in the statement he has just made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. Of course, as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Florida, if he wants a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, it should be granted him. There is nothing left of the O. C. D. except a glorified boondoggling proposition. Instead of giving the O. C. D. $750,000 we ought to cut it down to $250,000 and tell them to wind up their work quickly. The country is no longer in danger of invasion. We no longer need black-outs. The O. C. D. was overexpanded to begin with, even at a time when there was an element of danger, which has now disappeared. It is now silly to continue these appropriations when there is no need for them. I believe a further cut should be made in the appropriation instead of stopping with the moderate cut which has been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Kansas thoroughly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 9, line 18, to strike out "$538,000" and to insert "$403,875" was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word now in opposition to the committee amendment. I wish to thank all Senators, and especially the able Senator from Tennessee, for his courtesy. The able Senator is in error, however, when he says that I am asking that the appropriation be increased by $250,000. I only wish to restore the House appropriation respecting the Federal-State cooperative program, and not to restore even to the House item that part of the appropriation dealing with the preservation of property. There was a cut of about $39,000 by the Senate committee respecting the preservation of the Federal property owned by the O. C. D.,

but we will let that pass. I address myself only to the substitution of the House figure of $538,500 on page 9, line 18, for the Senate figure of $403,875.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is that the only item respecting which the Senator asks for a reconsideration of the vote?

Mr. PEPPER. That is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly the same situation applies to this item that applied to other amendments. The House figure ought not to be allowed. The amount of $403,875 which the Senate committee allowed is more than sufficient to do the work, and I hope the Senate will vote down the proposed amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The vote by which the amendment was agreed to having been reconsidered, the matter is now before the Senate, as I understand, in the form in which it came from the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The committee amendment reduced the appropriation. Therefore the vote is on the committee amendment, and there is no amendment being offered to it, as I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, if that be the case, I move the adoption, if I may, of the amendment as reported by the Senate committee, of $403,875. Those who believe the Senate committee was correct in presenting that figure will vote "yea." I hope the majority of the Senate, if not all Members present, will vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 18, to strike out "$538,500" and insert "$403,875."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to make this statement. The hour is late. A good many Senators have already left the Chamber. I assume we will be unable to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I favor all the appropriations contained in the bill except the one for the continuation of the F. E. P. C. I cannot vote for the bill with that appropriation in it. I wish the RECORD to show that I still oppose the appropriation for the F. E. P. C., and shall vote accordingly.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I favor all the appropriations contained in the bill except the appropriation for F. E. P. C., and, therefore, because that appropriation is now in the bill, I shall vote against the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4879) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS—AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the conferees have agreed upon a report to be made as a result of the conference on the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes. The report probably will not be ready for another hour or two, and I ask unanimous consent that I may file the report during the recess between now and tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Mr. WAGNER subsequently submitted the conference report on the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes. For conference report see p. 6372 of the RECORD of today's House proceedings.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma does not object I should like to dispose of the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. I do not think it will take more than 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4443) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 24, 33, 37, 50, 51, 54, 55, 57, 67, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47, 56, 58, 64, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,160,552"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,375,236"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$353,639"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$951,611"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$506,348"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$71,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a majority of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "(or in the case of perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That in the State of

Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$25,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 27, 31, 40, 41, 43, 48, 52, 53, 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, and 71.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY B. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELLL. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4443, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 20, 1944.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 31, 41, 43, 48, 52, 59, 66, and 71 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "*Provided,* That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "on" insert "extremely."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "That, excepting the foregoing item of $12,500,000, no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1944 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided further.*"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"Not exceeding $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further,* That benefits under this section to schools or child-care centers shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school or child-care center as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further,* That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25-percent limitation contained in this section: *Provided further,* That not more than 2 percent of the funds made available under this amendment shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds used in any State during any fiscal year under this paragraph shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the State and local school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers, or agencies having control thereof."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 65 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows: In the first paragraph of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$28,265,000" and insert "$26,000,000"; and in the third paragraph of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$96,710,000" and insert "$67,500,000."

That the House insist upon its amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 27, 40, 53, 63, and 65; and insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 60 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 27, 40, 53, 63, and 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Now I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4967, the Military Establishment appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4967) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement in connection with the pending bill. It is the bill which carries funds to support the Military Establishment for the next fiscal year. The bill contains appropriations of almost $50,000,000,000. It was passed by the House last Thursday. The Senate committee commenced hearings on Friday, held hearings on Friday and Saturday, reported the bill to the full committee on Monday, and the bill was reported to the Senate on the same day.

There are only about four slight amendments recommended by the Senate committee. One amendment reduces the appropriation in the sum of $1,217,000. That is caused by striking out of the bill funds for wildcatting for oil in Alaska. The Interior Department bill as passed by the House carried a sum to enable that

Department to wildcat for oil in Alaska. The Senate subcommittee, the full committee, and the Senate struck out the item. That action has been approved by the conference committee, and the report has been approved by the House. We expect the conference report to come to the Senate this afternoon or tomorrow. The subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations having stricken the amount for the Interior Department to wildcat for oil in Alaska, the subcommittee on the War Department appropriations likewise refused to approve an appropriation for the War Department to wildcat for oil in Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very brief statement explaining somewhat in detail the amount of money carried by the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The amount of money carried in the bill is $49,107,785,795, or a reduction of $1,217,000 below the amount approved by the House of Representatives.

The item is made up of two parts. One, an unexpended balance in the sum of $33,672,971,000 was reappropriated and the sum of $15,434,814,795 in new money is appropriated in the act and the sum of the carry-over plus the sum of new money makes the total of $49,107,785,795.

For the fiscal year 1943 the Congress appropriated the sum of $74,903,515,893 to carry on the many activities of the War Department and the bill covering the fiscal year of 1944 carried the sum of $74,211,249,961; hence, the bill now pending before the Senate carries a sum of $25,103,464,166 less than the appropriations for the current fiscal year and the sum of $25,795,730,098 less than the sum appopriated for the 1943 fiscal year.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Army is now built up to approximately the maximum number, the cost of conducting the war during the 1945 fiscal year should be something like $25,000,000,000 less than the expenses incurred during either the present fiscal year or the previous fiscal year.

An estimate has been made showing that 97 cents out of every tax dollar goes for war. An examination into expenditures further shows that we are getting more value for each dollar now than we received right after Pearl Harbor and this is because of the following facts:

First, early in the war the Congress enacted legislation providing for the renegotiation of all war contracts. Information has been made available that by the end of the present fiscal year the Government will have recovered, through renegotiation, a sum of approximately $3,500,000,000.

Another reason for the reduction in the amount of the pending appropriations is the fact that the economies in Army camps have been such as to reduce the cost of each soldier's upkeep approximately $36 per man. Most of the savings have resulted from the elimination of waste, from closer buying of equipment, and from redesigning and improving the wearing qualities of uniforms and clothing generally.

It is obvious that in order to train our vast Army that we had to purchase land, construct and equip camps of every kind, and now that the land has been paid for and the camps have been constructed and equipped, additional outlays for such purposes are not necessary.

The lands acquired have been paid for, the buildings erected have been paid for, the equipment in place has been paid for, and the efficiency of the workers in the factories permit of mass production on a more uniform basis so that the supplies needed by the Army are not costing as much as during the first and second years of the war.

At one time during the early planning for the war it was decided to raise and equip an Army of 8,200,000, but later these figures were revised, and the number of 7,700,000 were agreed upon. The reduction of the number in the armed forces amounted to approximately 6 percent, hence the appropriations reflect a reduction of much more than 6 percent.

The military strength of the Army is divided approximately as follows: Officers, 675,000; warrant officers, 30,000; nurses, 40,000; and enlisted men, 6,955,000.

At the present time there is an estimated number of 3,657,000 men outside the United States, and by December 31 of this year it is planned to have 5,000,000 men either on foreign battlefields or on foreign soil ready to take their places on the several fighting fronts.

The following facts are taken from the hearings. It requires some 5 pounds of food per day to serve each of our soldiers abroad; hence, the item of food costs, which includes transportation, is one of the major items of expense.

The bill carries the sum of $562,000,000 for the purpose of supporting the civilian population of the liberated countries. It is not planned that we shall feed all of the population in the coutries which are conquered and to be conquered. However, the plans are made to provide the liberated peoples who are in need of food the sum of 2,000 calories per day. The estimate for our own soldiers is 3,750 calories per day, so that the food to be made available to the needy in the conquered countries is scarcely more than one-half of the rations estimated necessary for the soldiers of our Army.

The bill carries the sum of $4,300,000,000 for lend-lease to be expended under the jurisdiction of the War Department. This sum of money is to be distributed roughly as follows: 64 percent to Great Britain, 26 percent to the U. S. S. R., 4 percent to China, and 6 percent to all other countries. The total sum reappropriated, together with the new funds, making the total of $49,107,785,795, is broken down substantially as follows:

Pay and travel	$12, 685, 000, 000
Subsistence	2, 899, 251, 000
Clothing and equipage	1, 721, 600, 000
General supplies	681, 000, 000
Transportation Corps	1, 850, 000, 000
Signal Corps	2, 540, 491, 075
Air Forces	12, 610, 200, 000
Medical Department	492, 204, 520
Engineer Service	2, 662, 212, 500
Ordnance Department	8, 599, 067, 600
Chemical Warfare Service	670, 000, 100
Expediting production	800, 000, 100
Special service schools, Department expenses, and miscellaneous	896, 758, 900

The amount recommended for the 1945 fiscal year is some $243,054,905 below the amount recommended by the Budget.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As I have stated, the bill carries appropriations of a little less than $50,000,000,000. Of that sum, $15,434,814,795 is new money and $33,672,971,000 is carry-over. It may be wondered why such a large sum was carried over. That is explained in the hearings and is also explained to some extent in the statement I have submitted. The War Department is now costing less than it formerly cost. When the war started we had to buy land on which to build camps. We had to construct buildings on the land and provide equipment for the buildings. We had to induct a large number of men into the Army. That expense has already been taken care of. The land is paid for, the buildings are constructed, the equipment is in place, and in the main the expenses are taken care of, so from now on the expenses of the War Department will probably grow smaller rather than larger because of the facts which I have just related.

As I have stated, the bill carries an appropriation of approximately $15,000,000,000 of new money and approximately $33,000,000,000 of carry-over money, making a total in excess of $49,000,000,000.

Only four amendments have been reported by the committee. At the present time, if the War Department desires to bring back from abroad some of our servicemen who have become worn out from fighting or flying planes, there is no provision of law which authorizes the Department to bear any of the expense of bringing them back; so the Senate committee recommends an amendment providing that the War Department may use these funds, within its discretion, to bring back from the fighting fronts such soldiers as the Department may think merit being brought back for rehabilitation and rest. That is the first amendment reported by the committee. We shall come to it in a few moments.

In connection with the second amendment reported by the committee, let me say that the House placed a prohibition in the bill denying the War Department the opportunity of continuing the education of medical and dental students. If that provision should remain in the bill, those two classes of students would be denied further assistance. It is the opinion of our committee that the War Department should maintain medical and dental students in the colleges so that when the war is over we shall have at least that additional supply of young doctors and dentists, to take the place of those who have been away, many of whom will be retired from service.

The third amendment reported by the committee has to do with the Alaska oil wildcatting, which I have briefly explained.

The fourth amendment reported by the committee deals with a provision inserted by the House preventing the War Department from leasing or selling any of the land which it now possesses. We think that provision goes entirely too far. We think that the antileasing provision should not be incorporated in the bill. Under the terms of the provision as it came from the House, the War Department could not transfer to the Navy any of the lands which it has. At the present time the War Department desires to transfer, and is actually transferring, land from its domain to the use of the Navy.

Those are the four amendments which the committee recommends. There is one further amendment which may be offered from the floor, which the War Department favors. Some time ago the Congress placed a prohibition in the War Department appropriation bill denying the right of the War Department to employ artists in making pictures of war

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I will make at that time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PREFERENCE EMPLOYMENT FOR VETERANS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4115) to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "honorably" and insert "on active duty."

Page 2, line 8, after "States", insert "and have been separated therefrom under honorable conditions and."

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "and the husbands of such service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "honorably" and insert "on active duty."

Page 2, line 20, strike out all after "authorized)", down to and including "ex-servicewomen" in line 25 and insert "and who were separated therefrom under honorable conditions."

Page 2, line 25, and page 3, line 1, strike out "honorably discharged."

Page 3, line 1, after "served", insert "on active duty."

Page 3, line 4, after "authorized)", insert ", and have been separated therefrom under honorable conditions."

Page 4, lines 14 and 15, strike out "in the service of the United States."

Page 5, line 5, after "of", insert "a."

Page 8, line 15, strike out "rating" and insert "ratings."

Page 11, line 11, after "eligibles", insert ", except of 10-point preference eligibles."

Page 12, line 19, after "apply", insert "to any position in or under the legislative or judicial branch of the Government or."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include an article on the electoral college.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the business today and any other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOOL PRODUCTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. When we were discussing the appropriation for U. N. R. R. A., I took the floor and did the best I knew how to explain what was happening to the wool producers of this country. Now I learn that the Commodity Credit Corporation is charging from one and one-eighth cents per pound up to two and four-fifths cents per pound for grading domestic wool. I enclose a table showing the total charges for grading this wool.

The following tabulation shows the total charge made with respect to all wool purchased by Commodity Credit Corporation through May 13, 1944:

Type of wool	Quantity purchased (pounds)	Rate per pound	Service and appraisal charge
		Cents	
Shorn wool (grease)	220,370,217	1⅛	$2,479,164.94
Pulled wool (grease)	26,160,128	1⅛	294,301.44
Shorn wool (scoured)	2,737,418	2⅝	76,647.04
Pulled wool (scoured)	25,696,452	1¾	449,687.91
Total	274,964,215		3,299,801.33

When Alexander Johnston, Chief of the Wool Division of the War Food Administration appeared before our committee he testified, and I quote—pages 71–72, hearing:

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have a particular test here which I will tell you about in a moment; I will give you the results of that. Two men in eastern Colorado, or western Kansas, I don't remember the exact spot, had a clip amounting to 50 bags and as it was being sheared one man took the even-numbered bags and the other took the odd-numbered bags, and they shipped it to the handler at two different spots under each man's name, you understand; and when the estimates of shrinkage came back on that wool one was 70 percent and other was 74 percent. The 74 percent wool was valued at $1.15 and the 70 percent wool was valued at approximately 5 cents more per pound that one fellow received above the other.

This [indicating on chart] is an average variation.

To give you the results in another way, on those 88 clips 54.5 percent of the core tests were within 1 percent of the actual shrinkage of the 10 bags, and of the appraisers only 25 percent, which is a little more than twice as great.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement, Senate amendment No. 41.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41, page 58, line 10, after the word "projects", strike out the words "including the cost of progressive and final liquidation of all of said project during the fiscal year 1945."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON of California moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the House will recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41, which makes it possible to continue the emergency guayule rubber project.

When the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill originally passed the House the House Appropriations Committee appropriated the sum of $3,952,585, but also provided for the complete and final liquidation of the project during the next fiscal year. At that time, however, the House committee had not had an opportunity to consult with Bradley Dewey, Rubber Director, nor did it have an opportunity to consider the report that has since been filed by the Poage committee, a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. The Poage committee has visited California and Texas, made a thorough inspection of the emergency guayule rubber project, and has unanimously recommended that it be continued. This view of the subcommittee has been concurred in by the full Committee on Agriculture.

It seems to me that there are a couple of fundamental policies involved that are going to be decided when we vote on this question. One is, Are we going to always continue to be dependent upon foreign sources for our entire supply of crude rubber? The other is, Do we believe in getting some return on our investment prior to liquidating a project of this kind?

Up to the present time some $45,000,000 has been appropriated, of which approximately $33,000,000 has been spent. We have now 32,000 acres of potential crude rubber in the field which, if harvested in an orderly fashion, following the 5 or 6 year liquidation program that has been advocated by the Forest Service, will yield us between 25,000 and 30,000 tons of crude rubber. It seems to me that we should get this return on our investment before we think of liquidating this project.

Up to the present time we have only produced some 440 long tons of crude rubber. It is good rubber. The Navy Department says so. The Rubber Director says so. The rubber factories, the rubber companies who use it, tell us it is good rubber. We do not need to worry about the fact that guayule does not produce rubber products which we need. We know it is excellent for mixing with synthetic rubbers in order to manufac-

ture rubber products that are vital to the war effort.

The argument is advanced that we will not have enough rubber from guayule to be important to the war effort. That is neither here nor there. We need crude rubber. Our inventory is dropping rapidly. If the Members will refer to that letter which I mailed them last Saturday, together with a copy of a letter from the Rubber Director, you will find that our inventory of crude rubber will be down to the very low figure of about 50,000 tons by the end of this calendar year. The Rubber Director says that to him it is unthinkable that we would liquidate any potential source of crude rubber under those conditions. I heartily agree with him. I do hope the House will vote to sustain the motion I have offered to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield gladly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It would be well to say that in terms of money and in simple language the amount involved in this appropriation will bring back, by harvesting the present crop, about three times the appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes. I would like to point out that if the project is liquidated next year, the cost of the very small amount of rubber obtained will be in the neighborhood of $3 a pound. If we go through an orderly program of liquidating during the next 5 or 6 years we will reduce that cost to about 53 cents a pound, which is considerably less than we are now spending for the small amount of rubber that we get from South America.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgement the Senate has taken the proper course and the House should concur. If we had followed the excellent advice of General Eisenhower in 1930 we would not have been caught with our rubber pants down on December 7, 1941.

We can and should take a farsighted view of the rubber situation and move now to protect our country from future shortages and from the domination of the powerful British-Dutch rubber monopoly. All of us hope that the war in the Pacific will be speedily and successfully terminated and that our former sources of crude rubber will again become available. However, I do not share the beautiful optimism of those who seem to think that the rubber plantations will be left intact and ready to produce by the Japanese.

The United States is spending millions of dollars annually on research and experimentation in various fields of endeavor. Why not spend some of this money in an attempt to develop a critical product that is so essential to our domestic economy?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter from the Rubber Director:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1944.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am informed that the conferees report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 1945, may be under consideration shortly. I feel that Members of the House of Representatives should be advised of my recent testimony before various committees of the Congress.

"I do not take any position on guayule as a commercial post-war crop but, as Rubber Director, I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I were to allow to pass without protest a decision that at this time would liquidate any supplies of crude rubber, whether growing in American fields, or in warehouses, as a result of operations in the jungles of South and Central America.

* * * In the meantime, we will be draining down our stock pile which is also too low today. We are down today to less than 115,000 tons of crude. We will be down to 55,000 tons by the end of the year. So, there is no question about the fact the we need crude rubber.

In view of the facts expressed above I sincerely trust that the House of Representatives will vote to adopt the Senate version of the section pertaining to the emergency rubber project. I am told that this would necessitate the House taking action to agree with the Senate on amendment No. 41.

Sincerely yours,

BRADLEY DEWEY,
Rubber Director.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include therewith a letter which I received from Mr. Bradley Dewey, Rubber Director.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman not yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Several Members have indicated a desire to speak in behalf of this motion, and so far as I know, I shall take the only time in opposition to it. It seems to me that if the gentleman would be satisfied with 2 minutes, that would be sufficient.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I will take whatever time the gentleman gives me, but the gentleman told me 10 days ago that I would be given 5 minutes. I did anticipate that is what I would have.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman is under the impression that I made such a statement to him I will yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Does not the chairman recall making that statement, because I asked him for 10 minutes and he said he would give me 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I do not remember that. If the gentleman says I promised him 5 minutes I will yield him 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to consume as little time as possible in calling the attention of the membership to the one question I think is involved in this guayule program. That is whether we are going to continue an important national insurance policy or whether we are going to let our insurance lapse for failure to pay the annual premium. I look upon our existing guayule acreage as the best and only insurance that we as a nation have against a complete lack of natural rubber. Possibly we will never need it. We hope we will not need it. We hope the war will be over; we hope our scientists will soon be able to produce synthetic rubber that will serve satisfactorily for all purposes without the admixture of any natural rubber. Unfortunately, we have no such synthetic rubber today. Just this morning I took a tire down to have it recapped. Much more important, you simply cannot build the tires needed for our B-29's and other heavy equipment with any synthetic rubber yet produced. It may be that next week someone will discover a new type of synthetic rubber, but I do not want to make our soldiers and sailors rely on such an uncertain event. We hope we never need to use an ounce of this guagule rubber; but, Mr. Speaker, I carry insurance, and so do most of the Members. At the same time, I never bought an insurance policy on which I wanted to collect. This Government may not have to use this guayule rubber, but just as surely as you need your life- and fire-insurance policies, just so surely does this Government need the insurance afforded by this 33,000 acres of guayule that the gentleman from Georgia would plow up. Unless the gentleman can give us some better guaranty as to the length of the war or the progress of future scientific development than he has been able to do, I think we would do well to pay the premiums on our rubber-insurance policy for another year.

The gentleman from Georgia would have us follow the bookkeeping of a man who would plant an apple orchard and at the end of 20 months go out and balance his books and determine he had spent a great deal more money planting his apple orchard than he had taken in in the production of apples from that orchard. That is exactly what we have in the case of guayule. We have a shrub that requires approximately 4 years for the minimum cycle of production. We knew it required that long when we planted it. We know that we cannot produce apples at the end of the first year. We knew we could not produce guayule at the end of 20 months in any appreciable quantities. I am not, therefore, very deeply impressed when the gentleman from Georgia tells us that the guayule project has not paid a profit. He will doubtless tell you that we have spent approximately $30,000,000. That is correct. We have spent that much on the natural-rubber projects of the United States. He will tell you that we have produced but a small quantity of guayule rubber. That is likewise correct. But nobody expected us to produce guayule rubber at the end of 20 months. We have actually done far better than we had a right to expect. We have our nurseries. We have our fields planted with 33,000 acres of guayule about 20 months old. If we leave it there approximately that much longer, we should be able to harvest from 25,000 to 30,000 tons of natural rubber just like this sample which I have here. I want the Members to notice that this is natural rubber. It is not synthetic rubber. We will be able to harvest natural rubber from that guayule which the conferees would have us plow up. We have produced sub-

stantial amounts of rubber already from the small acreage of old shrub which we bought from the Intercontinental Rubber Co., and we are today receiving very substantial shipments of guayule rubber from the wild shrub of old Mexico. Private companies own the Mexican guayule. They are not planning to plow any of it up. On the contrary, they are planting greatly increased acreages.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I wish the gentleman would bring out the fact that General Eisenhower, who is now leading the invasion, some years ago recommended guayule as a stand-by source of rubber for this country.

Mr. POAGE. I was just going to mention that very thing. I want to call attention to the fact that back in 1930, when General Eisenhower was a major in the United States Army, he was appointed to carry on a survey of the possibilities of the establishment of a reliable source of native rubber. After an exhaustive study of the subject he reported that guayule was the only practical source of native rubber in the United States, and recommended that we plant 400,000 acres of guayule. He pointed out that if we did that we would have insurance against exactly the situation that did develop.

The membership has seen the letter referred to by the gentleman from California written by the Rubber Director. As late as June 17, 1944, Hon. Bradley Dewey, the Rubber Director, said:

> I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I were to allow to pass without protest a decision that at this time would liquidate any supplies of crude rubber * * *. We will be down to 55,000 tons (of crude rubber) by the end of the year. So, there is no question about the fact that we need crude rubber. In view of the facts above expressed, I sincerely trust that the House of Representatives will vote to adopt the Senate version of the section pertaining to the emergency rubber project.

In the face of such statements from those who know best about our needs and our supplies of rubber, I simply cannot vote to destroy this much-needed commodity even if I were to admit the authenticity of the gentleman from Georgia's system of bookkeeping whereby he charges all of the cost of planting an orchard to the second year's production to find whether or not the orchard was profitable.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a situation where we simply do not have enough natural rubber to guarantee us the successful termination of this war. Until we have the positive assurance—and I do not believe the chairman of the committee can give us that assurance, I do not believe the House itself can give us that assurance—but until we have the positive assurance that we are going to have all the natural rubber we need to make our synthetics useful, we cannot afford to let this guayule project lapse. Bear this in mind, that most of the synthetic rubber is not today useful unless it is mixed with some natural rubber. The Rubber Director tells us that our stock pile of natural rubber is getting very small and he is not able to assure us that next year and the following year there will be enough to mix even the minimum needed percentage of natural rubber with our synthetic rubber to make it useful. We have a great investment in synthetic plants. Unless we have a minimum quantity of natural rubber to mix with the synthetics we lose much of their usefulness. And remember that it is entirely possible that the 25,000 or 30,000 tons of natural rubber that those acres of guayule will produce may well make a quarter of a million pounds of synthetic rubber useful.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this House cares to take the tremendous responsibility of saying that we are going to stop this work, destroy it here today because perchance it is going to cost us two to five million dollars a year to keep it going. We have spent $30,000,000 on it. It seems to me that it would be very poor economy to scrap it just before it gets old enough to produce rubber in commercial quantities. I do not question the fact that the Appropriations Committee has gone into the matter of costs. I do not question that the cost per pound is high, but where can they get a reliable source of natural rubber at a lesser cost? All costs of war are high, but the highest war costs are those that result from an inadequate supply of needed equipment and supplies. No equipment is more vital than rubber. No supplies can flow by land, sea, or air without rubber. We simply cannot afford to be without it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is very nice to hear the gentleman from Texas talk about that insurance policy, but we do know and are being told that we are getting toward the end of the war. We voted something along that line yesterday. Churchill thinks the war in Europe will end this year. The best military authorities say so.

There is nothing substantial in this program that will make the rubber available to us before the end of this war. We are not going to get any substantial help from it in prosecuting the war, and when the war is over we are going to have plenty of rubber from the East Indies. So what is the use of spending money on a program that will be of no use to us in the war effort, that will not be available to us until the war is over, and when it is over we shall not need it? That is the whole thing.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. Perhaps the guayule program should be curtailed, but it should not be abandoned. We must have rubber, and since the Japs have seized most of the natural rubber in the world, we must provide synthetic rubber, and also encourage the growth and processing of the native guayule. I am one of those who believe that Congress should give encouragement and support to the development of all our own natural resources, so that we may not be dependent upon any foreign country for the necessities of life we must have.

I represent the extreme western district of Texas. Much of mine is a semi-arid country. In the so-called Big Bend of Texas and especially in and about Alpine, Marathon, Sanderson, and Fort Stockton, there is a considerable amount of guayule growing in its native state. There would be much more if the ranchers and landowners were given some encouragement to take care of and cultivate these plants to maturity. All experts now admit that the guayule plant has great value as a rubber producer. If the entire program is killed the incentive is gone.

After the last war a factory was built in my district, at the town of Marathon. It was a success until native rubber was imported at such a low price the company went broke. I think there are great possibilities in this field, and I beg you to vote for the amendment.

(Mr. THOMASON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, just to get the situation clearly in mind, it is important to note that at the time we first authorized this guayule project it began with 60,000 acres. The War Food Administration claimed that too much lush acreage was being taken out of cultivation of food crops, and it was reduced to 31,000 acres.

When this bill was before the House we provided substantially $3,900,000 to put the guayule project on a liquidation basis and finally take it out of business. The Senate restored another million and a half to keep it going for another year on a maintenance basis and for the operation of an additional rubber mill.

I am going to support the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] to keep this project alive. I am doing so not because I have high hopes that guayule is going to give us the basis for a permanent rubber project—I do not believe that as a matter of fact, but with our crude-rubber stock pile, according to Col. Bradley Dewey, reduced to 55,000 tons by the end of the year, I do not believe we can take that chance. I am willing to abide by what Colonel Dewey says about it. He came before various committees of the House and Senate and made a real plea that this thing be kept going for a little while. That is one reason I am going along. The other reason is this: We are carrying on some rubber-development efforts in Brazil and in South America. We have now expended $81,000,000 in Latin America for rubber; $61,000,000 of that is in Brazil. The best calculations would indicate that this rubber will cost us $1 per pound. Rubber from guayule may cost us that much, maybe a little more, but we cannot take the chance not to have this guayule available to us. We should go along with the project on a maintenance basis for another year.

I may say in reply to the observation of my good friend and associate, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] that while there is every evidence that the victory will be won this year, yet it is a contingency. Our synthetic-rubber projects are getting on a good basis. This year we will be on a basis of about 864,000 tons annual production of synthetic rubber, but, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] pointed out, a certain amount of natural rubber has to be mixed with it, either from guayule or some other type of natural rubber in order to give it that resiliency and tensile strength in order to make it resist heat and friction. So my suggestion is that we should perhaps go along with this motion to recede and concur and give this project another chance, even though we may not believe it will prove the basis of a permanent rubber establishment in this country. It is in a sense an insurance project, and it is far better, in the light of our war needs of rubber, to be safe than sorry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the past there were many who did not believe that wheat, corn, sweetpotatoes, or blackstrap molasses could be used as a basis for synthetic rubber; however, you have been convinced that it could be and has been used effectively.

I am sure both you and I would prefer that this war end soon. I have some very close relatives in New Guinea and many other places. Not long ago four servicemen wrote their wills in blood. Their plane went down and they were captured by our enemy. They were injured and later they died. If we fail to provide the natural rubber that is essential to the production of synthetic rubber tires and your son or brother or any of our other servicemen lose their lives, when a tire blows out because it cannot stand the terrific pressure and heat, then you and I will be to blame.

We hope the Japs will leave some of those rubber bearing trees; we also hope there will not be a Jap left in that area, but in getting rid of the Japs we know that many, if not all, of the trees will be completely destroyed, too.

In my opinion and according to the agricultural men who are carrying on this project, it will increase in value in the next 12 months at least as much as the appropriations we make this year. I have no interest in it other than an interest in our country and servicemen. I am one of the four Members of Congress who went to California to investigate the guayule rubber program. There were two Republicans and two Democrats. Every one of us is a pretty close penny pincher, but we came back with a unanimous report and recommendation that this guayule rubber project should be continued as previously planned by the House Agricultural Committee.

I urge you to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that even if the war should end in Europe this year, and we certainly hope and pray it will, this will not open the rubber plantations in the Pacific?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The distinguished gentleman from Florida is correct. There is not enough rubber, with all the rubber we are getting, to meet the essential needs much less all of the pressing demands. Furthermore, Bradley Dewey, the Rubber Director, has pointed out that the need for rubber immediately following the war will be greater than it is now. The president of the Goodrich Rubber Co. has stated the same thing.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of those four Members of Congress who made a very searching and thorough investigation of the guayule project in California and the Southwest. Ordinarily we are quite interested in our own districts, in getting things for our own district, but guayule has no place in the Midwest, where I live. Therefore my interest is national in this problem.

We had some very interesting witnesses before us from the large rubber companies and every one insisted that this should be maintained for the present at least and for the next few years. We had men from the research departments, from the Navy Department, technicians, technical men, and rubber experts, all of whom said it is necessary that we maintain this guayule rubber project for the next couple of years anyway. They gave us some very pertinent reasons for continuing this project, which reasons I cannot reveal at this time on account of their military nature.

You talk about the cost of this. May I pay a little tribute here to the Forestry Service, under the very able direction of Mr. Paul Roberts, Rubber Director out there. They have done a very marvelous job. They have reduced the old process cost of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. many millions of dollars. They have just developed a continuous process in place of the old batch method, saving many, many thousands of dollars. In 1942 they employed 3,000 Mexicans out there to do hand weeding. In 1943 they only employed 300 to do the same job. They have also developed a process for destroying the weeds with an oil spray which does not hurt the guayule plant.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I hope the membership of this body will support the motion offered by the gentleman from California. Approximately 2 years ago it was my privilege to join with a subcommittee of a standing committee of this House which studied synthetic rubber. Testimony indicated the need for a synthetic rubber development in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, 1,800 pounds of rubber go into the construction of a 10-ton tank, more than 2,000 pounds go into the building of a Flying Fortress, and 150,000 pounds of rubber go into the fabricating of a warship. Rubber is a basic product in the material of fighting this mechanized conflict.

No one can say today during this debate, regardless of the utterances of Mr. Churchill, that this terrible struggle will end this year or next year. As Members of this legislative body we should do all that we can to see that there is a continuous flow of rubber products for the successful prosecution of the hard fighting yet to come.

I disagree vigorously with any man or any group in America who says now, as they have been saying, that after we have built our synthetic rubber industry in this country, when the war is over we should scrap it. I believe this Congress in its wise deliberations will deal with that problem sensibly at the proper time.

We must never again become dependent on foreign sources for rubber. No monopoly should exist, as it did prior to our entrance into the battle, when this country had no alternative but to buy from the British and Dutch. We paid the price, whatever it was at the time, for the rubber products or crude rubber shipped here from abroad. We can improve, and if necessary expand, our synthetic production to insure adequate supplies for the duration of the war, and for the increased peacetime consumption.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that due to the limitations imposed by the House in reference to the meeting of the House Military Affairs Committee today, at the request of the War Department I have called a meeting of that committee for 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. I hope that all members will be on hand at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning at that meeting.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

THE GUAYULE APPROPRIATION

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, when this House voted to strike from the agricultural appropriation bill the funds to carry the guayule project on to completion and orderly liquidation, several of us on this floor pointed out that such a step, in our judgment, was an error. Not only had the Office of the Rubber Director stated that we still faced an acute rubber shortage in this country but, at the time the appropriation was cut out, a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture had been authorized to investigate the whole guayule situation and was planning an inspection trip to the experimental station at Salinas, Calif.

What is the situation today? Let us review that situation briefly. The Sen-

ate committee, after checking the facts, decided that it was a wise course to reinsert the funds for continuation of the guayule work and for its orderly liquidation over a period of years, as provided in the original appropriation bill. The Office of the Rubber Director remains of the opinion that we continue to face a rubber shortage, and certainly the tons which will be made available from this experiment should be harvested. Finally, the special subcommittee of the House Agricultural Committee has visited the project, has made a thorough study into the whole situation, and has come to the unanimous conclusion that the appropriation for guayule should be retained. Certainly, on the basis of all the evidence we have, including the recommendation of our own subcommittee, we should reinsert this appropriation.

It is needless for me to recite the history of the guayule program again to the membership of this House. That has been done several times on this floor, by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], by myself, and by others. However, there are two or three points of special importance to which I should like once more to direct your attention.

The guayule project was an experiment. The need for knowledge about all aspects of it was tremendous. The scientific work which has taken place thus far has been in a sense preliminary to any later raising and processing of the shrub. Because of this fact, expenses have been higher than one would logically expect them to be from this point on. It is not fair, therefore, to judge the cost of producing guayule on the basis of the scientific groundwork which has thus far been laid. Experiments are continuing at the large station at Salinas; experiments in new strains and in new extraction processes which will provide the basis for lower and lower costs and for more profitable methods of production. Certainly it would be foolish suddenly to terminate this work, after we have already invested millions of dollars in it, just when the benefits of all the preliminary work are about to be realized.

We do not know how long this war is going to continue, especially the far eastern phase of it. It was from the Far East that the major portion of our natural rubber was obtained before Pearl Harbor. How long it will be before we can again get a normal supply from that source is problematical. Is it not common sense to hang on to what we have and to what will soon be available through guayule production? Is it not common sense also to carry through to completion the experimental work so that in case of future emergencies we shall have the knowledge necessary for providing a domestic rubber reserve?

This is a matter which is by no means limited to a single district or to a single State; it is Nation-wide in its importance and in its implications. I hope very sincerely that this House will follow the recommendations of our own subcommittee and the example of the Upper House and will restore the funds for guayule to the appropriation bill.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for granting me the time to make this brief statement.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 13, 1944.*

GEORGE E. OUTLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believing that if at all possible America should never again find itself facing a shortage of strategic raw materials such as natural rubber, may I urge you to vigorously oppose amendment 41, emergency rubber of agricultural appropriation bill which provides final liquidation of the guayule rubber project by June 30, 1945. This is in disagreement with Senate version which contemplates continuation of project. House amendment 41 also in disagreement with House approved amendment 42 emergency rubber appropriating $5,420,000 for expenditure in fiscal 1945 including the erection of one additional mill in 1945 and contemplates continuing the project and extracting the rubber over the next several years from the shrubs now in the plantations.

Nation's best informed rubber experts agree that shortage of natural rubber becoming more acute daily and that varying percentages of natural rubber necessary as mixture with synthetic to produce numerous essential rubber items. Guayule only available source for natural rubber production in America and with continued research which has already produced surprising results it would seem probable that natural rubber from guayule can be produced in America during post-war period at costs no higher than average of importations. During post-war period American agriculture likely to face most serious overproduction problems yet experienced when will greatly need tremendous expansion of new industries like guayule rubber. Indeed, abandonment and liquidation of this project during next fiscal year as specified in House approved amendment 41 might well prove national disaster if Pacific war long continued or certainly during post-war slump.

I am wiring you as a substantial farmer having studied and been interested in this guayule project for years. I am also manager of California Walnut Growers Association, one of Nation's largest farm cooperatives.

CARLYLE THORPE.

(Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when the war opened we were unexpectedly short of many critical materials, one of which was rubber, because we had expected to be able to hold the East Indies.

This proposition first came before a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having to do with deficiencies and that committee, although appreciating the importance of developing a local source of crude rubber, was dubious about the expenditure of the enormous sum of money which would be required, with the prospects of so small a return in actual crude rubber tonnage. The committee would have rejected it even in that distressed time had it not been that one member of the committee at that time called attention to the fact that no one knew how long this war would last. Many men were saying it would be a 10-year war. Some said it might last a generation and, as he said, we might be referring 5 or 6 years from now to the current year as one of the early years of the war.

Upon the prospect of a long war, something like the chilling possibility of even a 10-year war, and only on that prospect, this committee finally agreed to start this ill-advised project. It was a great mistake. Practically every dollar we have put into it has been lost or wasted. Every dollar beyond liquidation we put into it from now on will be utterly wasted.

We are nearing the closing days of the war. We are going to have all the crude rubber we will need by next year.

As a result of our experience with this project the next time this matter came before the subcommittee they voted unanimously against giving it another penny.

Of course, we expect wastage in war, but this huge wastage at this time is unwarranted and unjustified. Not only did the Subcommittee on Deficiencies vote unanimously after a long study of over 2 years of this matter against appropriating a dollar for the purpose, but it was then referred to another subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, under the jurisdiction of my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], one of the most level-headed men who ever sat in this Congress. It was again given an impartial study.

We did not take into consideration the interest of some one section of the country or some individual district or some particular industry. We took into consideration the interest of the United States and the United States Treasury, and that committee also voted unanimously against putting another dollar into this program.

My friends, you will shortly be on your way to the hustings to give an account of your stewardship. Many of you will decry what you will term extravagant expenditure, high taxes, unnecessary Government activities, and bureaus, and your undying opposition to all of them. No one can go out and criticize unnecessary Government expenditure when he has voted for this unnecessary expenditure. No one can denounce large Government pay rolls when this amendment means more employees on the Government pay rolls in a useless waste of money. No one can complain about high taxes when this amendment will unnecessarily increase taxes. No one can condemn a multiplicity of Government activities when this amendment means continuing an unnecessary Government activity. If you expect to do any preaching in your campaign this fall now is the time to practice what you preach. And if there is any disposition to dispute that, you have the unanimous report of two different committees, both Democrats and Republicans, all of them testifying to the fact.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. How did the thing get up to the floor of the House then?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Another body put it in.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would just like to point out for the information of the gentleman who previously addressed the House, that as far as my congressional district is concerned, there is not 1 acre of guayule in it, so I hope my attitude is as national as that of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have no interest in this matter other than the interest of every American citizen in our trying to do whatever is necessary to win the war, and at the same time conserving the financial resources of the Nation and preventing wasteful expenditures wherever that is possible.

The emergency rubber project has so far expended about $45,000,000. So far there have been processed 440 short tons of rubber. We are assured that if this program is continued in accordance with the motion made by the gentleman from California they will be able to process 700 short tons of rubber in the fall and winter of this year. You will find that information set out on pages 570 and following of the House committee hearings.

If you will examine those hearings—and I trust you may have the opportunity to do so before you vote to continue this wasteful expenditure—you will find that very little hope is offered for the production of rubber from this project to aid in the war program or, indeed, for several years after the probable end of the war by the experts who have testified before our subcommittee in regard to this matter.

The most optimistic prediction, as I recall—and the predictions have not always been in accord, even those made by the experts—is that if we continue the program for 7 years, ending in 1951, we will be able to secure by this expenditure of something over $5,000,000 a year, if we have good luck, 10,000 tons of rubber during the whole 7-year period, at an expenditure, in addition to the $45,000,000 which has already been spent, of about $35,000,000, or $3,500 a ton, or $1.75 a pound, for the rubber which it is hoped by the most optimistic might be recovered in the further prosecution of the program.

The estimate of the cost of producing rubber per pound has varied from $3, according to testimony given by Mr. Caswell before the deficiency subcommittee a couple of years ago, to estimates as low as 27 cents per pound by the most optimistic; that is, 27 cents per pound plus whatever may be obtained from the sale price of the rubber, which, of course, would run the price, according to this optimistic prediction, up to 50 or more cents per pound.

In 1932 natural rubber was being imported into this country and sold at 3 cents per pound. Guayule rubber contains 77 percent of the efficiency and value of this imported rubber. Of course, the 1932 prices were very low and probably much lower than would obtain under ordinary conditions. However, it is apparent, I think, that this is not an industry that can be maintained after the war, because the cost of the production of the rubber from guayule is so much greater than the cost of the importation of the much superior natural rubber that it would be impossible for such an industry to carry on in this country, unless the plan which has been formulated by some of the interested people, of having the Government guarantee the price of American-produced rubber at a level which will enable that rubber to compete with imported rubber, even though the cost of the imported rubber be only a fraction of the American-produced rubber, is consummated. That is what they have in mind, to have the Government subsidize an American guayule rubber-producing industry. Some of the farmers in California have indicated their willingness to participate in this guayule program if they are subsidized in that way.

One thing is clearly apparent. The farmers of California have not been interested in the program as at present carried on. They demanded last year that the program be abandoned and that all of this fertile land which has been diverted to the production of the guayule shrub be restored to agriculture.

Mr. Jeffers, who was then Director of the emergency rubber-project set-up, transmitted his recommendation to the Congress that the program should be abandoned for the time being and the land restored to the farmers from whom it had been taken by purchase or by lease, for the production of essential agricultural commodities, and agreed that there was no excuse for the labor that was being used in the guayule-production project and the machinery which was being used being diverted from other uses more essential to the war.

Remember that last year they had first sent over an estimate of $56,000,000 for this project, but when Mr. Jeffers changed his mind and decided to turn these lands back to agriculture, they voluntarily reduced that estimate to $13,000,000, estimating that much because they thought they might not be able to turn back all of the 60,000 acres of land involved. They did, however, turn back 28,000 acres, leaving 32,000 acres still under Government control and use. Sixteen thousand acres of that 32,000 acres is irrigated land. Some of it, according to the hearings, is worth $800 per acre. It is exceedingly valuable land for agricultural production.

As I have pointed out, there is no chance of this program being of any benefit as far as the war effort is concerned. I think the backers of this project realize that fact. They are hoping that some kind of an industry may be set up which will be of use to agriculture after the war.

It is significant that after this program had been virtually abandoned last year they decided to engage in a different sort of activity. They have bought about 200 experimental plots in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. Apparently they located each of those plots close to a live chamber of commerce. The result has been that a tremendous interest has grown up in these several States in the attempt to develop an industry which might be of service to agriculture after the war.

I believe those who are leading the farmers and business bodies of those States to believe that that is possible are doing them a disservice instead of a service. I think that anyone who reads the hearings in relation to this subject matter must come to the conclusion that it is an absolute impossibility that any such industry should flourish after the war, and further, that if it is carried on now it will be of very limited if any benefit whatever to the war program and certainly not of sufficient benefit to justify the expenditures involved.

If you want to continue to spend these large sums of money without appreciable result so far as the war program is concerned, that of course is your affair. I am merely expressing the views of the majority of the conferees in the hope that further wastage of funds in this activity may be prevented.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman, as I understood him, made the statement to the House from the hearings before his committee, that on the basis of $5,000,000 a year for the next 7 years the estimated return of rubber would be only 10,000 tons.

Mr. TARVER. I think that is probably a somewhat optimistic prediction.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I have the figures the gentleman had before his committee, and they can be found in the hearings. At a steadily decreasing expenditure which will be less than $5,000,000 next year, less than $3,000,000 2 years hence, and down to $2,000,000 6 years hence, the estimated return in crude rubber will be 29,000 tons. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair and does not desire to leave the wrong figures before the House.

Mr. TARVER. I want to be fair, but I was giving to the gentleman the consensus of the experts who testified before our committee. I do not recall that any of the several witnesses who appeared insisted that 29,000 tons of rubber could be recovered. My recollection is, as I stated, that 10,000 tons was the more optimistic prediction.

Let me point this out. In order to recover 350 tons of rubber you have to set up a $500,000 mill. The estimate which is sought to be approved here contemplates the purchase of another mill. They have one with which they can process 350 tons. If you provide this money, they propose to build another one at a cost of $500,000 with which they can process an additional 350 tons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

For every annual capacity production of 350 tons of rubber you will have to provide an additional mill at a cost of $500,000.

It is all right to say we need rubber Of course, we need rubber. General Eisenhower in 1930—he was then a major of Infantry—made some investigation of the guayule rubber industry. His report is of no advantage as far as the present situation is concerned. In his report he points out that:

The officers detailed on this inspection are not technically trained in rubber production. The inspection was for the purpose of gaining first-hand information of conditions as they now exist and impressions as to personalities—

And so forth. In his further report you will find that the general, then major, said that we ought to provide for a source of raw rubber in the event of possible trouble with Japan. He quoted almost entirely from officials of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. as to the prospects of this guayule experimentation, but he did recommend that it be continued. It was continued for 12 years by the Intercontinental Rubber Co. after that. They made a failure of it, then they got out and sold it to the Government at a big price. Now we are advised that they would not consider buying it back on any terms at all. They have washed their hands of it; they have gotten through with it.

The experimentation has been done. Everything that can be learned about making rubber from guayule has been learned. If on account of the activities of these chambers of commerce in California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona you want to continue a program here which offers no hope to them and less hope to the Nation, at an expense of some $5,000,000 plus per year, that of course is your responsibility. I am simply giving you my views as gathered from the evidence to which I have listened in connection with this matter.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the evidence taken before the gentleman's committee indicate what the cost of production of synthetic rubber is at the present time?

Mr. TARVER. It does, but I am unable to quote exactly the cost. It is of course very much less than the cost of the production of guayule rubber.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the evidence indicate what the cost of production of natural rubber that is being imported now from South America is in comparison with the cost of production of guayule rubber?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. That cost is very high, I may say to the gentleman, but so far as the war is concerned and war usage, it would not be a question in my mind of the cost of rubber which may be utilized during the war, but the point is that you cannot get any rubber out of this project to amount to anything during the war; 700 tons for this year, none last year, 440 tons in the winter of 1942–1943. There is no prospect of satisfying the need for rubber at any price out of this program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. According to the way the hearings look to me, there are about 440 tons of rubber that might be harvested in the coming fiscal year. Is that about right?

Mr. TARVER. No. Four hundred and forty tons were harvested the first year of the program, none last year, and 700 tons will be harvested this fall and winter if we provide $500,000 to provide another mill.

Mr. TABER. Seven hundred tons would be 1,400,000 pounds. If $3,000,000 were appropriated, that would be a little over $2 a pound.

Mr. TARVER. It is more than $3,000,000, I may say to the gentleman from New York because they are planning on using the $2,000,000 unexpended balance in addition to that, making the amount that they propose to use something over $5,000,000.

Mr. TABER. The amount that is directly appropriated would be $3,000,000, would it not?

Mr. TARVER. That is right. There is an unobligated balance of $2,000,000 which is available for expenditure, making the total amount in order to get 700 tons of rubber something over $5,000,000. I may say that with the appropriation as we carried it in the House bill they contemplated using the mill they have now and processing 325 tons, so we would get only 375 tons additional by the adoption of the gentleman's motion as far as this coming year is concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 108, noes 20.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground no quorum is present, and make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 43, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—299

Abernethy
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barrett
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Bland
Bloom
Bolton
Bradley, Pa
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buck
Bulwinkle
Burchill, N. Y.
Busbey
Butler
Byrne
Camp
Canfield
Carlson, Kans.
Carrier
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Case
Chapman
Chenoweth
Church
Clark
Clason
Clevenger
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Compton
Costello
Cox
Cravens
Crosser
Cunningham
Curley
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Davis
Dawson
Day
Delaney
Dewey
Dilweg
Dingell
Dirksen
Drewry
Dworshak
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Ellsworth
Elston, Ohio
Engle, Calif.
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Fogarty
Fulmer
Gale
Gallagher
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillespie
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Hall, Leonard W.
Hancock
Hare
Harness, Ind.
Harris, Ark.
Hart
Hartley
Hays
Hébert
Hendricks
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Howell
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Jarman
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Anton, J.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley
Keogh
Kilday
King
Kinzer
Kirwan
Kleberg
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
LeCompte
Lesinski
Luce
Ludlow
McConnell
McCowen
McGehee
McGregor
McKenzie
McMillan
Maas
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merritt
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Morrison, La.
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Myers
Newsome
Norman
Norton
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Toole
Outland
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Philbin
Phillips
Pittenger
Poage
Poulson
Powers
Pracht, C. Frederick
Pratt, Joseph M.
Priest
Ramey
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Richards
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rolph
Rooney
Rowan
Rowe
Russell
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Satterfield
Sauthoff
Scanlon
Schiffler
Schwabe
Scott
Scrivner
Shafer
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Sullivan
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Talle
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolan
Troutman
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walter
Ward
Wasielewski
Weaver
Weichel, Ohio
Weiss
Welch
Wene
West
Wickersham
Willey
Wilson
Winstead
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NAYS—43

Bates, Mass.
Beall
Buffett
Burgin
Cannon, Mo.
Celler
Cooper
Courtney
Crawford
Doughton
Durham
Folger
Forand
Johnson, Okla.
Kean
Kerr
Knutson
Lambertson
McCormack
McWilliams
Maloney
May
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neal
Ploeser
Rees, Kans.
Robinson, Utah
Rohrbough
Sheppard
Slaughter
Smith, Ohio
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder

Sundstrom	Tarver	Woodrum, Va.
Taber	Whittington	
Talbot	Wigglesworth	

NOT VOTING—88

Allen, Ill	Furlong	McMurray
Arnold	Gibson	Magnuson
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Barden	Granger	Merrow
Bell	Green	Miller, Mo.
Bonner	Hagen	Mills
Boren	Hale	Morrison, N. C.
Boykin	Hall,	Murdock
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	O'Connor
Brumbaugh	Halleck	Pace
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Burch Va.	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Ga.
Burdick	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Heidinger	Plumley
Capozzoli	Herter	Price
Chiperfield	Horan	Rabaut
Colmer	Johnson,	Reece, Tenn.
Cooley	Calvin D.	Reed, N. Y.
Dickstein	Johnson,	Sheridan
Dies	Luther A.	Smith, Va.
Disney	Kennedy	Stearns, N. H.
Dondero	Kilburn	Stewart
Douglas	Klein	Taylor
Elmer	LaFollette	Torrens
Engel, Mich.	Landis	Towe
Fay	LeFevre	Treadway
Fellows	Lemke	Whelchel, Ga.
Fish	Lewis	White
Ford	Lynch	Whitten
Fulbright	McCord	
Fuller	McLean	

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Miller of Missouri.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Brumbaugh,
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 60: Page 67, line 18, beginning with the words *"Provided further"*, strike out the balance of line 18 and lines 19 to 25, and page 68, strike out lines 1 to 17, inclusive.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 60.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 60.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 60.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may have that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is not an individual in my congressional district affected by this amendment. I am simply trying to help out in a very difficult situation.

When this matter came before the House I analyzed the amendment and came to the conclusion that it denied to the people of the Agricultural Department the right of free speech and the right of petition. I concluded that the amendment and the Harness amendment should not be in the bill. There is not another appropriation bill which carries an amendment of this character nor one that ever did.

I consulted the Comptroller General to find out if my analysis was correct. I took the position that they could not pay the Department of Agriculture employees unless there was a clearance every month in the form of a statement or affidavit that the employee had not violated the provisions of this amendment. It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the employees of the Department of Agriculture are subject to the Hatch Act and also subject to the Corrupt Practices Act. Mr. Warren, Comptroller General, wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee in the Senate, advising him that it was his opinion that if the amendment stayed in the bill the disbursing officer would be required to have a clearance from every official and employee of the Department monthly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman certainly does not condone the action of these Triple A people out in the field who are trying to force the farmers to join programs they do not want to join in order to be deferred from the draft or to get any kind of rationed articles. Does the gentleman condone that practice?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will answer the gentleman in this way: I will do everything in my power to assist the gentleman and other Members of this House to bring about the discharge of any employee who is guilty of any of the charges that were made on this floor.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How are you going to do it any other way than we have provided in this bill? This has acted as a deterrent. You have not heard these complaints since we inserted this amendment in the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. You can do it under the Hatch Act.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No. You cannot reach them under the Hatch Act.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then place them under the Hatch Act. I will repeat what I said. I will do anything that I can to prevent any employee of the Department of Agriculture guilty of the charges that were made on the floor engaging in that kind of conduct and I will insist that they be discharged if they do. That answers the gentleman's question. But the gentleman has tried to meet this situation in a way that he is punishing 99 percent of the employees of the Department of Agriculture for the act of 1 percent. I understand this amendment was not recommended by the subcommittee. It was put in by the full committee when it considered the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. COCHRAN. I accept the correction. The gentleman should know. I do know that some members of the subcommittee are not in favor of this amendment and never were in favor of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The Harness amendment was put in on the floor, because the House knew that it had to be done.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman; it was put in on the floor, but the original amendment was not put in on the floor. It was put in by the full committee.

Mr. TABER. It was put in by the subcommittee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Alright, by the subcommittee. In any event, you place an amendment in this bill that is found in no other appropriation bill, and never was contained in any other appropriation bill. If any Member has a solution, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the motion.

As I said before, there is not a single individual in my district who is affected by this amendment. I am just trying to help out. I know the Comptroller General is greatly disturbed by this amendment. He told me he was.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We have had the Hatch Act in effect for how many years now?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know, but several years.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It has been on the statute books for at least 2 or 3 years, and yet this practice has been indulged in. We have proved it on the floor of this House. You cannot depend on the Hatch Act to stop it. This is the

only means of stopping it, and if we leave this amendment in the bill, it will be stopped.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is the gentleman going to require 99 percent of the employees of the Department of Agriculture to make an affidavit every month in order to get their pay?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would rather have every employee of the Department of Agriculture make an affidavit every month than to permit them to continue to impose upon the farmers of the country as they have in the past.

Mr. COCHRAN. I heard the speech of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who stated that two employees of the Department had visited his district. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that the Appropriations Committee, with the chairman at the head of it, could not go to the Department of Agriculture and get the Secretary to stop the practice?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that in my judgment, if what he says is true and has happened, it is the fault of the management of the agency, and that this amendment should be directed to the head of the agency, and he ought to be fired if he does not stop it. Do not deprive the employees of their rights simply because the management of the agency has failed to curb one or two employees who may have done wrong.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is my purpose now to analyze this amendment.

First, it prohibits any employees of the Department of Agriculture from engaging in any political activity or lobbying activity—including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office.

This goes so far that if an individual had a brother or sister employed by the Department of Agriculture and he or she was a candidate for any political office from constable up, it does not have to be a Federal office, that individual is prohibited from lending the relative any financial support or asking any individual to vote for the candidate. The activity would be confined solely to the vote of the employees.

Second. Further analyzing the part of the amendment that I have quoted, no official or employee of the Department of Agriculture could attend a Jackson Day or a Lincoln Day dinner, or any kind of a meeting where any part of the cost would divert to a political party, or to any organization or association that would be actively engaged in politics.

No official or employee of the Department would be permitted, under other provisions of this amendment, to contribute an article or write a letter to any newspaper or other publication expressing his or her views in reference to any candidate for any political office.

Further, there is a provision that prevents any employee of the Department taking any action whatsoever in reference to any legislation pending in Congress, be it an appropriation or any other kind of legislation.

There is another provision that prevents any employee from visiting a Member of Congress or talking to a Member of Congress over the telephone in reference to any matter in which he or she might be interested.

If this is not denying the right of petition to the officials and the employees of the Department, I do not know what the language means. The amendment is so worded that unless a Member of Congress or a committee of Congress requested information from an individual in the Department, or the Department itself, the information could not be furnished.

The Harness amendment relates solely to per diem employees and provides that no part of the money can be used to pay them if personally, or by letter, he or she demands that a farmer join the A. A. A. program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.

In view of what has been said by various Members of Congress relative to the activity of those in control of the A. A. A. program, I would not offer any objections to that proviso, but I do object to the general language that was placed in the bill by the committee, which covers every official and employee of the Department.

I cannot see how the House of Representatives can place such restrictions upon 99 percent of the employees of the Department of Agriculture simply to reach 1 percent who they accuse of activities which the Harness amendment proposes to prohibit.

Freedom of expression and the right of petition are guaranteed by the Constitution and the House of Representatives should not attempt by legislation to set aside these guaranties.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this amendment when it was offered to the bill, and I see no reason for changing my views. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that the Hatch Act has not done the business. It was necessary to write this provision into the act in order to correct an evil that has been growing by leaps and bounds. Within the month I have had letters from farm constituents complaining that they could not get an allocation of sufficient gasoline, nor could they get tires, unless they agreed to join the Triple A and the program for crop control.

There is no question but what this provision should stay in the bill. If we vote to take it out, then we lay ourselves open to censure by those who believe that this Government should not be run by petty bureaucrats and crackpots.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the proviso for placing a restriction on political activities and lobbying activities on those who are on the Federal pay roll, particularly in the Department of Agriculture, was inserted in this bill by the subcommittee. It was approved by the full committee. It was approved by the action of the House.

The bill went to the Senate. This item was stricken from the bill by the Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations. It was reoffered on the Senate floor by Senator DANAHER in slightly revised form. It was voted down on the floor of the Senate—if I may trespass on the rules long enough to get this story before the House—on the 17th day of May, by probably a strict party vote, at least so the RECORD indicates. That is the whole story about this amendment.

Should it remain in the bill or should it be deleted? The chairman of our subcommittee offers a motion that the House further insist on its disagreement. That is the thing we should do. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] proposes that we recede and concur. In my judgment that is the thing we should not do.

If we are going to preserve clean politics and develop an atmosphere where we get away from pernicious political activities on the part of any person who has a vested interest in the Federal pay roll because he has a job, then there must be a restriction, similar to that proposed by the subcommittee.

The gentleman says that the Hatch Act applies. That statement was also made in another body. But let me point out to you that on the 6th day of January 1941, Mr. Mastin White, then Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, said:

> It is the opinion of this office, therefore, that the officers, committee members, and employees of the county agricultural conservation associations are not officers or employees of the United States within the meaning of section 9 of the Hatch Act.
>
> From this it would appear that the Hatch Act does not apply to all persons who serve in agricultural functions.

That is the Solicitor's opinion; not mine.

It occurs to me that there ought to be an interdiction on those political activities. We have restrictions, of course, on lobbying the Congress on appropriations, and that sort of thing. That act was put on the books long ago and it is known as the Antilobby Act. It was enacted after the First World War, when a rather surcharged pay-roll lobby attempted to persuade the Congress on every piece of legislation that came along. Too often it is freely violated. There have been some violations.

Here is a photostatic copy of a letter which our investigators obtained from the files of the Department of Agriculture pertaining to the dismissal of Mr. Schooler, regional director of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the west central region. He was fired by Chester Davis for those activities. In my office, too, is a file of photostats that we obtained from the Department of Agriculture which indicates many abuses, many meetings, many telegrams sent at Government expense, that seek either to persuade Congress to a course of action, or go into some kind of po-

litical activity against Members of this body.

If we are going to preserve clean politics, then obviously those who have that vested interest in the pay roll should, to some degree, at least, be restricted from operating as sort of a great governmental political machine. I know of no other way to do it effectively in the light of this opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture in 1941 than to retain this interdiction in the present bill.

That is the whole story in a nutshell. I hope that the proposal offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] will not prevail. I trust that the motion made by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, chairman of the subcommittee, will prevail, and that the House will insist, and that we get some kind of action on this problem.

An examination of the legislation which has been enacted over the years with respect to elections and the exercise of the voting right indicates the same common pattern, namely, the preservation of the voting right free from influence, domination, interference, or coercion. In fact, the language of the Hatch Act speaks of the right to choose officials without interference. The original Corrupt Practices Act under which candidates for Federal office must file statements of receipts and expenses and the inhibitions against contributions by corporations chartered under Federal law are all designed to keep our elections free and representative and uninfluenced by some dominating influence. In the light of that pattern, why should those who have an interest in the Federal pay roll and in the perpetuation of the administration which provided them with a job not come under some reasonable restriction so that pressure in the form of political activity cannot be exercised to influence the course of an election? This is the very theory of the Hatch Act and since it is impossible for this House to legislate in an appropriation bill, no other course is available than to provide a restriction on the appropriations whereby those engaged in such political activities are prevented from drawing pay out of the Federal Treasury.

When all is said and done, they are the recipients of public funds and, therefore, have no fair right to engage in that type of political activity which, by the letter and spirit of the Hatch Act, has been outlawed. They have their choice. They can leave the Federal pay roll if they like and become politically active. It does not restrict their right to vote; it does not restrict their right to talk politics privately and freely; but political activities in the accepted sense as interpreted by the Civil Service Commission are restricted. That is what this, in fact, does.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think this amendment is for the protection of a large group of people who do not care to be forced into political activity, which they have been, and I do not think that is an idle statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is exactly right. It is oftentimes so easy for one in a position of authority to impress his will on his subordinates. We can protect those people on the pay roll by preserving this interdiction. When the first vote comes on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, I hope that it will be voted down and that we will maintain the committee's position.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the conferees on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'stabilization Extension Act of 1944.'

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

"TERMINATION DATE

"SEC. 101. Section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1944' and substituting 'June 30, 1945.'

"AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

"SEC. 102. Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'PRICES, RENTS, AND MARKET AND RENTING PRACTICES

"'SEC. 2. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Price Administrator (provided for in section 201) the price or prices of a commodity or commodities have risen or threaten to rise to an extent or in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, he may by regulation or order establish such maximum price or maximum prices as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this Act. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum price, the Administrator shall ascertain and give due consideration to the prices prevailing between October 1 and October 15, 1941 (or if, in the case of any commodity, there are no prevailing prices between such dates, or the prevailing prices between such dates are not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, then to the prices prevailing during the nearest two-week period in which, in the judgment of the Administrator, the prices for such commodity are generally representative), for the commodity or commodities included under such regulation or order, and shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability, including the following: Speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities, during and subsequent to the year ended October 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no such regulation or order shall contain any provision requiring the determination of costs otherwise than in accordance with established accounting methods. Every regulation or order issued under the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be accompanied by a statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation or order. As used in the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the term "regulation or order" means a regulation or order of general applicability and effect. Before issuing any regulation or order under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order, and shall give consideration to their recommendations. In the case of any commodity for which a maximum price has been established, the Administrator shall, at the request of any substantial portion of the industry subject to such maximum price, regulation, or order of the Administrator, appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members, and shall meet at the call of the chairman. The Administrator shall from time to time, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classifications, differentiations, and adjustments therein. The committee may make such recommendations to the Administrator as it deems advisable, and such recommendations shall be considered by the Administrator. Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act, he may, without regard to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, issue temporary regulations or orders establishing as a maximum price or maximum prices the price or prices prevailing with respect to any commodity or commodities within five days prior to the date of issuance of such temporary regulations or orders; but any such temporary regulation or order shall be effective for not more than sixty days, and may be replaced by a regulation or order issued under the foregoing provisions of this subsection.

"'(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act, he shall issue a declaration setting forth the necessity for, and recommendations with reference to, the stabilization or reduction of rents for any defense-area housing accommodations within a particular defense-rental area. If within sixty days after the issuance of any such recommendations rents for any such accommodations within such defense-rental area have not in the judgment of the Administrator been stabilized or reduced by State or local regulation, or otherwise, in accordance with the recommendations, the Administrator may by regulation or order establish such maximum rent or

There has been added at the end of the provision above referred to a proviso as follows:

"*Provided, however,* That such amount shall be the amount of the overcharge or the overcharges or $25, whichever is greater, if the defendant proves that the violation of the regulation, order, or price schedule in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation."

This proviso has been included at this point in lieu of the proposed new section 205 (g) which the House amendment added to present law. Such subsection (g) would have applied also in the case of criminal proceedings and suits for suspension of a license. There appeared to be no need to apply the provision to criminal proceedings because a conviction may be obtained only in cases of willful violations under the present provisions of the Act.

The Senate bill added to section 205 (e) a new sentence as follows:

"Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or the amendment thereto of Act October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729 Seventy-seventh Congress), all suits for civil damages shall be brought in the district or county in which the defendant against whom substantial relief is sought resides or has a place of business, or office, or agent."

No such provision was contained in the House amendment. It has been included in the conference substitute in modified form as a proviso added at the end of the third sentence of section 205 (c).

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 205 (F)

The House amendment amended section 205 (f) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 by adding the following proviso:

"*Provided,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 301 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, or any other law, no such license shall be suspended in any other manner, for any other cause, or for a longer period of time, than provided in this subsection, and no regulation, order, license, or requirement heretofore or hereafter issued or prescribed pursuant to any provision of law other than the provisions of this Act or of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, may validly contain any requirement as to the observance of any regulation, order, license, or requirement issued or prescribed pursuant to this Act or under the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942."

This provision has been included in the conference substitute with modifications so that it reads as follows:

"*Provided,* That no regulation, order, license, or requirement heretofore or hereafter issued or prescribed pursuant to section 2 (a) (2) of the Act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the Act of May 31, 1941, and by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, may validly contain any requirement as to the observance of any regulation, order, license, or requirement issued or prescribed pursuant to this Act or the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942."

REVIEW OF RATIONING SUSPENSION ORDERS

The Senate bill included a proposed new subsection to be added at the end of section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as follows:

"(g) The district courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside, in whole or in part, orders for suspension of allocations, and orders denying a stay of such suspension, issued by the Administrator pursuant to section 2 (a) (2) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the act of May 31, 1941, and title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under authority conferred upon him pursuant to section 201 (b) of this act. Any action to enjoin or set aside such order shall be brought within 5 days after the service thereof. No suspension order shall take effect within 5 days after it is served, or, if an application for a stay is made to the Administrator within such 5-day period, until the expiration of 5 days after service of an order denying the stay. No interlocutory relief shall be granted against the Administrator under this subsection unless the applicant for such relief shall consent, without prejudice, to the entry of an order enjoining him from violations of the regulation or order involved in the suspension proceedings."

This subsection has been included in the conference substitute.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1 OF THE STABILIZATION ACT

The House amendment amended the first section of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, so as to make it mandatory that the President exercise the authority which he now has under that act to provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities. This provision is not retained in the conference substitute.

MAXIMUM PRICES FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND THEIR PRODUCTS

The House amendment inserted in section 3 of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, a new proviso as follows:

"*Provided,* That the maximum price so established may be charged or collected by the processor or manufacturer only when the producer of the agricultural commodity has received, as to any agricultural commodity acquired by the processor or manufacturer subsequent to thirty days after the effective date of this amendment, approximately the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this section, and upon failure of the processor or manufacturer to submit satisfactory proof thereof such processor or manufacturer may charge and collect not more than 90 per centum of the maximum price so established."

This provision is not retained in the conference substitute, as there are other provisions in the conference substitute which are designed to assure that producers of agricultural commodities receive the prices specified in this provision.

The Senate amendment added to section 3 of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, a new paragraph containing a specific formula for the establishment of maximum prices for textile products processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from cotton or cotton yarn. This paragraph also provided that the method now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for cotton should also be used for price-control purposes. The conference substitute omits the formula which was contained in the Senate bill for fixing maximum prices for cotton textiles, but it retains the provision relating to the method of determining the parity price or its equivalent for cotton. This provision, along with the provisions which are designed to assure producers of commodities prices equal to the standards specified in the Stabilization Act, is contained in the new provisions which are added by the conference substitute at the end of section 3 of the Stabilization Act as follows:

"On and after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, it shall be unlawful to establish, or maintain, any maximum price for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price below the highest applicable price standard (applied separately to each major item in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn) of this Act.

"The President, acting through any department, agency, or office of the Government, shall take all lawful action to assure that the farm producer of any of the basic agricultural commodities (cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts) and of any agricultural commodity with respect to which a public announcement has been made under section 4 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1941, as amended (relating to supporting the prices of nonbasic agricultural commodities), receives not less than the higher of the two prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this section (the latter price as adjusted for gross inequity).

"The method that is now used for the purposes of loans under section 8 of this Act for determining the parity price or its equivalent for seven-eighths inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for seven-eighths inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this section; and any adjustments made by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator for grade, location, or seasonal differentials for the purposes of this section shall be made on the basis of the parity price so determined."

LOAN RATE FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate bill contained provisions, not in the House amendment, increasing the basic loan rate for cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts from the 90 percent provided in existing law to a new rate of 95 percent of the parity price. This section also made a corresponding increase from 90 to 95 percent of the parity or comparable price in the case of price-supporting operations for nonbasic agricultural commodities. The conference substitute retained only so much of this provision as relates to an increase in the loan rate for cotton and provides that, in the case of cotton, the new loan rate shall be 92½ percent of the parity price.

CONTINUING INVESTIGATIONS OF THE STABILIZATION PROGRAM

The House amendment added a section to the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, providing that the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, should be authorized to conduct investigations of stabilization activities and the effect of such activities on industry, production, renting and housing, and distribution. The conference substitute does not retain this provision.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WM. B. BARRY,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the part of the House.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that when the Hatch Act was before this House I voted against it and spoke against it. I thought at that time that it was one of the most peculiar pieces of demagoguery and hypocrisy that had ever been brought into this body. There is not a man in this body that some time or another in ad-

dressing the Kiwanis Clubs or high school graduation exercises has not said it is the duty of every citizen to participate in the politics of this country. Yet you would cut off a large segment of our population from taking part in the body politic. Why not cut out the farmers, who receive subsidies and other moneys from the Government? Why not cut out those people who work on the roads, who also receive their checks from the United States Treasury? Let us not adopt a holier-than-thou attitude. Let us be practical and give to every American citizen the right to have an active say in his own Government.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a single man or woman in this House who will condone the practice of some of the Triple-A agents in the field of saying to the farmers of this country, "If you want draft deferments or if you want a rationed article or commodity, you must join the Triple-A program whether you believe in it or not." That is reprehensible, and you agree with me when I say that. This amendment will stop that practice. If you want to protect this Triple-A program and the honest men and women who are participating in it, you had better go along with this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say for clarification that when the Senate struck out the so-called antilobby provision it also struck out the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana on the floor, which he refers to at the present time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this confined to the Triple A program?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then why does not the gentleman offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment and apply it to the Triple A alone?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This applies to the Triple A program in the Agricultural appropriation bill. It is the only way that I know you can reach it.

Mr. COCHRAN. On the other hand, you are penalizing every other employee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. You are not penalizing anyone unless they violate the law. My good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], awhile ago said, "Why do you want to penalize all of the employees of the Agricultural Department?" This does not do that at all. It is not going to penalize a single individual unless he indulges in the practice that we are denouncing here today.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman will make his amendment apply the Hatch Act to the people whom the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says are not covered, I will vote with him, but he is applying this penalty, which goes far beyond the Hatch Act as I understand it, to a group of people who the gentleman does not even claim have attempted to violate any regulation at all.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman is such an astute lawyer that he knows that statement is incorrect. He knows that this does not apply to anyone except that small group throughout the country who have been violating the law. The Triple A program has agents in every county in the United States. In the 10 counties that I represent, every county has an organization of the Triple A. Most of these men are good, honest, conscientious people who would not indulge in this practice. We have a few, however, in my district and in other districts, who have been forcing the Triple A program on unwilling farmers who apply for draft deferment and rationed farm machinery or gasoline. These are the men we want to reach by this amendment. We have taken it up with the heads of the agencies, as the gentleman from Missouri suggested awhile ago. They appear to be helpless in the matter. They say, "We did not know this was going on, but how are we going to stop it?" This amendment will stop it, and I hope you will vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the average man working for increased food production, and I do not care whether he is an A. A. A. man or any other man with an Agricultural Extension position, does not care to be mixed up in partisan politics. He may have his opinions and he is entitled to them just as much as anyone here has to his political opinions. The great majority of these men do not want to be involved in partisan politics. The reason I supported this measure when it was here on the floor before is that from my observation I am convinced that the little fellow does not care to be in politics. He has been following bad advice from a superior or from superiors.

Mr. Dodd has made every effort to prevent politics in his department. Mr. Evans, the A. A. A. Administrator before Mr. Dodd, was also opposed to political activities. A few men have no doubt become involved in political activities and have not cooperated with other Federal agencies working for increased food production.

What do you suppose is the reason given for noncooperation?

The answer every time—and I believe them, for they are men I have known—was that they got the order from on high, so they should not be criticized for doing something they had orders to do.

If you pass this amendment, these little fellows that are out in the byways and the byroads on the farms will not be forced by anyone in a higher office to do things and carry on political activities they do not want to carry on and in which they know they should not be engaged. For that reason, I hope we maintain the position the House took when this agricultural appropriation bill was up for consideration before.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say just a word for those Members of the House who are unfortunate enough to serve on the Committee on Appropriations? And may I say they have been particularly unfortunate in the last 2 years? Their task—always a difficult one—has been especially difficult during the War Congress when all nonwar expenditures were necessarily being reduced or discontinued. It is much easier to give everybody the appropriations they want. It is much more pleasant to be a good fellow and say, "Why, certainly, we will report out your appropriation. How much do you want?" than it is to be a grouch and be always saying, "No, we have to save some of the taxpayers' money. We cannot appropriate everything there is in the Treasury. We must somewhere at some time in some way exercise just a little economy."

That is the primary issue in this amendment. It was the elementary and unavoidable necessity of retrenching nonwar expenditures and reducing nonmilitary appropriations that brought about the situation giving rise to this provision in the bill.

The war has entirely changed our national fiscal system. Before the war when the United States was the richest nation on earth, with enormous resources and vast revenues and the American people entertained a great and growing interest in the social phases of government, we appropriated for all departments an ever-increasing flood of funds and contractural authority. Each year appropriations were higher and expenditures more lavish for innumerable new activities until the totals reached stupendous sums of money.

And every new agency and each additional activity created and financed grew like proverbial trees from little acorns. Each agency and every employee reached out constantly for more money, more authority, wider jurisdiction, more employees, and additional prerogatives. Government budgets mushroomed and pyramided and skyrocketed.

Even before the war we had begun to realize that this could not go on forever; that there must be a limit somewhere; but no stopping place could be found and taxes and expenditures raced each other until we were brought suddenly up against the necessity of diverting all energies and resources to arming the Nation for war. The first war need was money. And the first casualties of the war were the nonwar expenditures. Every expenditure not directly contributory to the war program was cut to the bone.

Of all the departments which had enjoyed rapid growth and expansion the Department of Agriculture was probably the most favored. And naturally when it became necessary to retrench civil expenditures the budget of the Department of Agriculture was decreased in proportion to its previous expansion. The total appropriation for the Department of Agriculture at its highest was in excess of $1,000,000,000 per annum. In cash appropriation it is now about half that amount. We made the cut regretfully, but it was inevitable. In the greatest war in history, with the survival of our form of government at stake, guns and planes and tanks and ships came first.

But the employees in the Department did not take kindly to the reduction in their appropriations and the curtailment of their activities. They not only protested but they organized and they organized for political activity.

They sent three men over my district, Victor M. Robb, Paul Dubboert, and one other whose name I have forgotten. These three men traveled over my district on Government pay and at Government travel expense and contacted the agricultural committeemen of the district. They told them I was working against the farmers' interest; that I was trying to destroy the A. A. A. and the F. S. A.; that I was the greatest enemy of the farmer had in Congress.

Such efforts at political activity originating here in Washington—these three men said they were acting under orders from their superiors—strike at the foundation of representative government. They threaten the most jealously guarded prerogative of the Congress, the control of the national purse strings. Whenever a Government department or bureau or other agency can threaten or coerce or intimidate Members of Congress to the extent of dictating their own appropriations, our form of government is in danger. And that is exactly what they were trying to do. These men did not know me personally. I never saw them to my knowledge. I had had no correspondence with them. They were civil-service employees of the Department of Agriculture. Their only information was secured from an order issued by someone here in the Department of Agriculture in Washington to proceed, at Government expense, to bring political influence to bear on me at home to force me to increase departmental appropriations.

The power of such a political organization can be understood when it is remembered that these men have represented the Government in making loans and grants of Federal money to a large part of the people of the average congressional district. They appeal to the beneficiaries of their largess and to their hope of future loans and grants. No more potent political machine can be devised.

As explained when this provision in the bill was last before the House, I did not draw it. I did not suggest it. But as it is now under consideration I give you my own experience for what it is worth. It is of no personal consequence to me. The people at home know, and the Members of this House know, my attitude toward agriculture. And the efforts of these three industrious gentlemen fell on barren soil. But that was not their fault. It was not the fault of the organization here in the Department which directed their efforts. This paragraph in the bill will discourage such activities, will protect Congressmen when they consider it necessary to reduce expenditures or deny new appropriations.

This provision has the unanimous approval of the subcommittee and the whole Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, told me just now that he put the question but did not vote for it. He did not vote against it. An attempt was made to take this clause from the bill when it was last before the House. Another attempt is now being made to take it from the bill. To take it from the bill would be to encourage Government employees to organize and intimidate Members of Congress and dictate the amount of the funds which will be turned over to them for their expenditure. And no department of the Government has ever yet been given as much money as it wanted.

I ask the Members to support the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations; to support the action of the House when it passed this bill and to support the managers on the part of the House on the conference committee. This proposition has received an overwhelming majority every time it has been voted on at every stage of its consideration. I trust the House will vote down the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and support the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY].

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, the practices which this amendment is designed to curb are current today. Last Friday I placed in the RECORD a written statement signed by 63 Montgomery County, Ohio, farmers, which states affirmatively over their signatures that representatives of the A. A. A. had suggested to them openly that it would be easier to obtain deferments for their sons, and that they would get greater allowances of gasoline with which to operate their farms and farm equipment, if they joined this organization. With that statement I placed in the RECORD 3 affidavits, signed by some of these farmers who used the names of the A. A. A. representatives who were guilty of these practices. There appear on page A3320 of the RECORD for June 16. It is high time that this House affirmatively and definitely stopped these practices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make my position on this matter perfectly plain. I voted for the Hatch Act and I still believe that any employee of this Government who expects to make a career of the Government service must give up some political rights. I would be perfectly willing to have the Hatch Act extended, or an amendment added to this bill which provided that any employees who are not covered by the Hatch Act, as alleged by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be covered by it. But the objection which I have to the provision under discussion is that it is undertaking to legislate on an appropriation bill about a matter, the jurisdiction of which belongs to the legislative committees; that it is penalizing employees of the Department of Agriculture who are not involved in the matter. The Committee on Appropriations has a staff and has the funds with which to hire investigators. If any such things have happened as have been alleged here, why do they not investigate it and why do they not present the names of the guilty parties to the Secretary of Agriculture for dismissal from the service? That is the procedure which ought to be followed by the Committee on Appropriations instead of bringing in a blanket indictment against some thirty-odd thousand employees and presenting an administrative problem which the Comptroller says cannot be worked out. That is the orderly procedure and that is what this House ought to do.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this problem came up before one of the committees of which I am a member, in connection with O. P. A. regulations. We discussed the matter with the top officials of the Office of Price Administration, who, in turn, made their own investigation and found that these very things of which we are complaining had been happening, following which they issued definite orders against the continuation of such practices, but they have been continued, notwithstanding, in many instances.

So there is sufficient evidence these practices have been followed and are still occurring regularly in the United States.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to say to the gentleman and to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that I turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture at least 50 complaints with the names of the individuals, and as far as I know, nothing has ever been done about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have yielded myself this time in order that I may endeavor to make clear for the RECORD my individual position. Members of the House will understand that in offering the motion to insist upon disagreement to the Senate amendment I was acting by direction of the House conferees, as is my duty. However, there is nothing contained in legis-

lative ethics which will prevent me expressing my individual opinion. My fellow conferees have not hesitated to do that in the consideration of several matters in connection with this conference report, and strange as it may seem, in connection with one of the votes on an amendment in disagreement, I was the only member of the House conferees who voted to sustain the position of the House conferees. So at this time I desire to explain my position personally, and not as chairman of the conferees, with regard to the pending motion.

I fear this disagreement between the House and Senate over this political amendment may delay the enactment of the Agricultural Department appropriation bill. I do not believe the Senate will recede from the attitude which it has assumed, and has assumed by a very considerable majority. The question, therefore, presents itself——

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield at this time. I will yield later. The question presents itself as to whether or not we should persist in the difference of opinion between the two bodies over this amendment which, in my judgment, is of minor importance, and thereby delay and perhaps make impossible the enactment before the proposed recess of the Congress of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

In my judgment it would be better for each of the bodies to yield something on this question rather than to bring about that result.

As far as I am individually concerned I voted against the Hatch Act. I did not approve of the Hatch Act at the time of its passage and I do not approve of it now. I do not believe that Government employees should use the time for which they are paid by the Government in any sort of political activity or in endeavoring to solicit the making of appropriations by the Congress. That latter type of activity has been for years expressly prohibited by law, and is a criminal offense. That law is applicable to all Government employees. But, when a Government employee has finished the discharge of his duties his time is his own, and I do not feel that he should be prohibited from the expression of his opinion on any political question which might exist or be under discussion in his locality.

I seem to remember a few years ago when the Republicans were in power that the outstanding exponents of Republican doctrines in my district were the Republican postmasters, both when on duty and when off duty. They were agitating on behalf of Republican principles and Republican candidates. It has only been since the Democrats have assumed charge of the Government that it has been made a crime or an offense justifying removal from office for an employee of the Government to take any interest in political matters.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

As far as the Harness amendment is concerned, if the facts upon which that amendment is based can be shown, those facts should be dealt with in some way, because that amendment was based on the idea that while men were engaged in the performance of their duties they were making representations which were unauthorized in order to force the farmers of the country to go into the farm program. I do not agree with the statement that those charges have been proven. Except for the submission of a few postal cards and letters to the House of Representatives, they have not been proven. I feel there ought to be some way to deal with offenders of that type, if they do exist. And perhaps there may be a few in the country somewhere. There should be some way of dealing with them otherwise than by putting a restriction on this bill that would require the submission of a certificate every month by every employee of the Department of Agriculture as to his not having been guilty of this practice, before he can be paid his monthly salary.

I have submitted this motion to insist on disagreement with the Senate amendment. I do not intend to vote for my own motion, because I have a right to disagree with the attitude taken by the House conferees. I believe the House should recede from its position in this matter and let this bill go to the White House, as it will in a day or so if the motion of the gentleman from Missouri shall be agreed to. But, if you prefer to stay here and fight all summer over what is purely a political question, of course, that is a matter of your own judgment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman feel that if we have a roll call and go on record very definitely against proceeding under this amendment, the Senate will realize the importance of it and will yield?

Mr. TARVER. On the contrary I do not believe the Senate will yield on this amendment as at present written, in any event. I hope the Senate will not. I opposed the Harness amendment as strongly as I could when it was adopted in the House. I believe its adoption in its present form is exceedingly unwise, but if the House should further insist, if it should adopt my motion to insist on disagreement with the Senate amendment, it is my hope that we may be able to work out some modified form of this language which might meet the approval of both bodies. I think the simplest and fairest way to deal with the matter would be to agree to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. I do not believe there is any reason for applying a different rule to the employees of the Department of Agriculture from that applied to employees in all the other different branches of the Government.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. It is significant to note that the Department of Justice reports with reference to the Hatch Act that grand juries refused to bring true bills and petit juries refused to convict. There have only been five convictions, three resulting in suspended sentence, one resulting in 1-cent fine and 1 hour in custody of the marshal, and only one case ended with the imposition of a fairly significant sentence. Those are the only five convictions which were had during the whole period of the life of the Hatch Act.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, we cannot repeal the Hatch Act here, but it does seem to me, since you have the Hatch Act on the books, and since you have on the books a statute making it illegal for the time of a Government employee on duty to be used in soliciting appropriations from the Congress or in political activity whether on duty or not, that that should be sufficient, unless you want to apply a different rule to all other employees of the Government than to the employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. How would the gentleman be able to take this back to conference to work out a modification, which he suggests, unless we vote down the preferential motion?

Mr. TARVER. I say in my judgment the House ought to adopt the motion, but if it does not adopt that motion, then I hope we may be able to work out in conference, some modified form of the language of the two provisions which are here in dispute, which will meet with the approval of both bodies. I think the best way to end the matter would be to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TARVER] has expired.

Does the gentleman from Kansas insist on his request that the question be divided?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Shall the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 60?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 50; noes 137.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 219, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—123

Allen, La.	Coffee	Grant, Ala.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Colmer	Green
Barden	Cooley	Gregory
Barry	Cooper	Hare
Bates, Ky.	Courtney	Harris Ark.
Beckworth	Crosser	Hays
Bland	D Alesandro	Hendricks
Bloom	Davis	Hoch
Bonner	Dawson	Holifield
Bradley, Pa.	Dingell	Izac
Brooks	Doughton	Jackson
Brown, Ga.	Durham	Jarman
Bryson	Eberharter	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Bulwinkle	Fernandez	Kee
Burchill, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	Kefauver
Burgin	Flannagan	Kelley
Camp	Fogarty	Kerr
Capozzoli	Folger	King
Celler	Forand	Klein
Chapman	Gordon	Lane
Clark	Gore	Lesinski
Cochran	Gorski	Lynch
	Gossett	

McCormack
McGehee
McKenzie
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Marcantonio
Merritt
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Myers
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Price
Priest
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin
Richards
Robinson, Utah
Rooney
Rowan
Sadowski
Sasscer
Scanlon
Sikes
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Sullivan
Tarver
Thomas, Tex.
Vincent, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Ward
Waslelewski
Weaver
Weiss
Wene
Whittington
Wickersham
Winstead
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—219

Abernethy
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Bolton
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burch, Va.
Busbey
Butler
Canfield
Cannon, Mo.
Carlson, Kans.
Carrier
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Case
Chenoweth
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Compton
Costello
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Day
Dewey
Dilweg
Dirksen
Drewry
Dworshak
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Ellsworth
Elston, Ohio
Engle, Calif.
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Fulmer
Gale
Gallagher
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillespie
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Hall, Leonard W.
Hancock
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash
Hope
Howell
Hull
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Anton, J.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Keefe
Kilday
Kinzer
Kleberg
Knutson
Kunkel
Lambertson
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Ludlow
McConnell
McCowen
McGregor
McWilliams
Maas
Mansfield, Mont.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
May
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Morrison La.
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Newsome
Norman
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
O'Konski
Phillips
Phillips
Pittenger
Ploeser
Poage
Poulson
Powers
Pracht, C. Frederick
Pratt, Joseph M.
Ramey
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowe
Russell
Satterfield
Sauthoff
Schiffler
Schwabe
Scott
Scrivner
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Sumner, Ill.
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Thomas, N. J.
Thomason
Tibbott
Troutman
Vinson, Ga.
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Weichel, Ohio
Welch
West
White
Wigglesworth
Willey
Wilson
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Wright

NOT VOTING—88

Allen, Ill.
Arnold
Bell
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Brumbaugh
Buckley
Burdick
Byrne
Cannon, Fla.
Chiperfield
Curley
Delaney
Dicksteln
Dies
Disney
Dondero
Douglas
Elmer
Engel, Mich.
Fay
Fish
Ford
Fulbright
Fuller
Furlong
Gibson
Gifford
Granger
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Halleck
Harless, Ariz.
Harris, Va.
Hart
Hébert
Heffernan
Heidinger
Herter
Horan
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Luther A.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilburn
Kirwan
LaFollette
Landis
Lemke
Lewis
Luce
McCord
McLean
McMurray
Magnuson
Mansfield, Tex.
Merrow
Miller, Mo.
Mills
Morrison, N. C.
Murdock
O'Connor
Pace
Patman
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Plumley
Rabaut
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Sabath
Sheridan
Smith, Va.
Starnes, Ala.
Stearns, N. H.
Stewart
Sumners, Tex.
Taylor
Tolan
Torrens
Towe
Treadway
Wadsworth
Whelchel, Ga.
Whitten

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McMurray for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Brumbaugh against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Miller of Missouri against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.
Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. Hale against.
Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Elmer against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Fuller against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson against.
Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Engel of Michigan against.
Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Arnold against.
Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Landis against.
Mr. Torrens for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Halleck against.

General pairs:

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Chiperfield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 79, line 22, insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws, (2) loans to needy individual farmers, (3) grants, and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $28,265,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $57,000 for compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under his supervision, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

"In making any grant payments under this act the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $96,710,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at not to exceed the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion, or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agricultural commodities.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation, shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1945 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In the first paragraph of said amendment, strike out the sign and figure "$28,265,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,000,000."

In the third paragraph of the amendment, strike out the sign and figure "$96,710,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. This is a very important matter and a quorum should be present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Andrews, N. Y.	Brumbaugh	Dawson
Arnold	Buckley	Delaney
Auchincloss	Burdick	Dies
Bell	Byrne	Dirksen
Boren	Cannon, Fla.	Disney
Boykin	Chiperfield	Dondero
Bradley, Mich.	Cooley	Douglas
Bradley, Pa.	Crosser	Elmer
Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Calvin D.	O'Connor
Fay	Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Konski
Fish	Johnson, Luther A.	Patman
Ford	Kennedy	Peterson, Ga.
Fulbright	Keogh	Pfeifer
Fuller	Kilburn	Phillips
Furlong	Kirwan	Plumley
Gale	LaFollette	Rabaut
Gibson	Landis	Reece, Tenn.
Gifford	Lemke	Reed, N. Y.
Granger	Lewis	Rizley
Hagen	Luce	Robinson, Utah
Hale	McCord	Sheridan
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McLean	Smith, Ohio
Halleck	McMurray	Smith, Va.
Hare	Magnuson	Snyder
Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Tex.	Stearns, N. H.
Harness, Ind.	Merrow	Stewart
Harris, Va.	Miller, Conn.	Taylor
Hart	Miller, Mo.	Tolan
Hartley	Mills	Torrens
Hébert	Morrison, N. C.	Towe
Heffernan	Mundt	Treadway
Heidinger	Murdock	Wadsworth
Herter	Murray, Tenn.	Whelchel, Ga.
Holifield		White
Jennings		Whitten

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr COOPER). Three hundred and twenty members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time we have talked about Farm Security this year. A year ago you remember the trouble we had when we asked for a rule. The Committee on Agriculture went to the Rules Committee and asked that we not have a rule waiving points of order.

We have been legislating for a great many things for years that we had no authority for. Let me say incidentally right here, we have not yet had authorization for 40 different things that we passed in March. The Pace bill is not a law yet. Now, when this year came around we went into hearings on agriculture, and just before we brought our bill to the House we had the Pace bill which did authorize many of these projects—all but Farm Security.

That was left out because there was going to be a special bill dealing with that from the Cooley subcommittee. About 15 months ago they started their investigation and I understand that only last Saturday did the committee report a bill. That is the first Cooley bill that has been reported out of the whole Committee on Agriculture authorizing Farm Security. There is nothing in the law yet that has authorized it. The Pace bill went to the Senate. We did not put anything in the House appropriation bill for Farm Security; the Senate did; they put in $97,000,000 for new loans with $28,000,000 for administration the day the Pace bill conference was agreed to. The Pace bill came back here and once or twice the Pace bill conference committee report with withdrawn from the house and taken back in to conference. I was trying to follow it as well as I could, keeping in touch with the chairman. I happened to be off the floor one afternoon, June 1, and it was brought in here 2 days before both whip notices said it was going to be called up and after a point of order was sustined against the conference report. The Clerk read the Farm Security amendment which did not mention Farm Security by name. Nobody said it was Farm Security, nobody asked what it was. At the time the Clerk read it nobody said anything and the Speaker put the motion and it was carried. More was said for congressional pensions than F. S. A. That was the first authorization Farm Security ever had in its whole existence and that was secured without one Member's saying one word for it or anybody's asking a question as to what it contained.

The school lunch was the next amendment read and it was discussed an hour and passed. It canceled Farm Security.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was on the floor at the time that provision was up for consideration. I did not say anything about it. There was probably a good reason why many other Members did not say anything about it, particularly members of the Committee on Agriculture. As the gentleman knows, the Committee on Agriculture through a subcommittee, called the Cooley committee, conducted an investigation of the Farm Security Administration having in mind to ascertain some of the facts regarding Farm Security, particularly with reference to communistic activities and projects. The Cooley committee reported a bill to the full committee. This bill created a new organization called the Home Farmers' Loan Corporation, setting up a tremendous corporation with nearly a billion dollars' worth of assets. A good many of us on the committee felt we were not in favor of creating such a corporation at this time and would not support it until there was a complete revamping of the whole farm credit structure, which the committee is going to undertake. So we thought it best to permit the continuance of Farm Security for another year with appropriations so there would not be any lapsing of time in the operation of this type of direct lending.

I want to point out to the gentleman that I believe the appropriation for land purchases and administrative expense is far in excess of what it should be; the amounts are excessive. For instance, last year Farm Security spent around $28,000,000 to administer about $100,000,000, going to pay salaries and traveling expenses, automobile upkeep, and so forth. The people who are to be benefited are not getting anything out of this appropriation. So there was a curtailment of the administrative activities.

But, getting back to the point to which the gentleman has referred, let me say that if the Farm Security could be continued for another year with adequate appropriations to take care of maximum needs I believe it would be satisfactory, because we believe that inside of another year we shall be able to establish a division in the Farm Security Administration to take care of this credit for

rural farmers who are not able to get credit elsewhere.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I thank the gentleman. Last spring we were promised this Cooley bill and we thought we should have our day in court here where the whole matter of authorization could be thrashed out without there being involved any question of funds, but we were denied everything that had been promised us. It was left out of the first Pace committee bill because it was feared it would make a controversial matter. We were expecting it in a separate bill and I looked forward to it with a lot of interest because we were going to have a real show-down on it. The fact is we have not had it at all. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], called up a conference report the other day and the House concurred in an amendment. Nobody asked what the amendment was, either. It seems the House just dropped into a lethargy. On the other hand, that last amendment was a very vital socialized medicine amendment and nobody asked a word about it: under that set-up the people cannot even choose their own doctor. That amendment they offered and it was agreed to by the House without anybody's seeking to modify it.

I just want to show you what has happened to Farm Security, how it was eased along. The Senate put it in. The House conferees without any authority from the House yielded. The House itself had left it entirely out, expecting an authorization bill. But it was brought back in this way and was authorized. The Pace committee yielded to the Senate, when they were helpless before their own larger committee.

I am opposed to the whole proposition of Farm Security. It should be liquidated. It was born of Tugwell; it has been communistic all through. The last Administrator, Mr. Baldwin, before the present one, now is the assistant director of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee with Sidney Hillman. A man who used to be the head of N. Y. A. went into the Farmers' Union as an organizer, an organization I used to be proud of and was an active member of and held offices in, but which is dominated nationally today by the same influence, the C. I. O. You got this letter the other day telling you what you ought to do about this Farm Security. They want to put back the Senate figures. The C. I. O. did not do so well in Maine yesterday. I understand our good colleague was renominated 10 to 1 against the C. I. O. candidate who opposed him in the Republican primary; so we should not be worried about that.

In this letter they are concerned about the returning soldier to the farms—they are interested only in driving the farm wedge.

Another thing: We provided for the liquidation of 150 communistic projects in Farm Security. They said our mandate would be carried out. My chairman will probably say something about that, because he knows it is true that they have not been liquidated. Our orders have not been carried out. They do not intend to liquidate any communistic project, although they got extra money to do it. There is a new man connected with this outfit, a former colleague of ours, an outstanding fellow, but I cannot understand why we have not had some liquidation in the last year or more under the authorization of the Congress. It just shows their determination to do this thing. We know how they handled the labor proposition for the farmers a couple of years ago, how the C. I. O. got their fangs into that thing and mussed it up with Farm Security hanging onto it. This thing was put through as a twin of W. P. A. when the farmers needed help and everybody else needed jobs. I think it is perfectly ridiculous now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The next amendment provides $20,000,000 to buy farms for tenant farmers in a period of war and inflation—$20,000,000 to buy land. Not a dollar should be spent to encourage anybody to buy land at this time at inflated values. They talk about rehabilitation. Nobody needs rehabilitation today out here on these farms. They are doing pretty well as they are. The only argument they have left under the present war situation is to produce more food. I deny that it has this result. I have not time to go into that. I do not think it provides a bit more food to make these rehabilitation loans to farmers.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. We are likely to get confused on this. Rehabilitation was part of our basic law under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act. That and rehabilitation loans are a part of our basic law. It comes under the Bankhead-Jones Purchase Act.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. It is part of our basic law.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. There never was a law for the other part of it.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I will say, however, that much of it has been maladministered. To that extent I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The Bankhead-Jones matter is a land-purchase proposition. There was no legal authority and there never was any law passed that created these other things that have been set up by Executive order and carried on for years. The only authorization has been this left-handed authorization which we gave it on June 1.

Mr. Speaker, I am in the position of opposing the gentleman's motion to recede with an amendment, which provides for a lesser sum. I am opposed to extending the whole proposition now, including the pernicious activities of the C. I. O. associated with Farm Security, which runs through the whole proposition.

Let us have a show-down on this proposition today. Let us vote against the thing that will even reduce, then try to sustain the position of the House that we have not authorized anything for this purpose and maintain our position.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the House Committee on Agriculture has recently reported a bill which we hope to bring before the House at some time in the early future. In that bill we have provided for an expeditious and orderly liquidation of all of the objectionable projects which have been administered by the Farm Security Administration and we have likewise provided for abolishment of all of the Federal lending agencies which are engaged in making direct loans to low-income farmers.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. But you have been 15 months getting it done and selling it to the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I grant that we have been several months in preparing the bill but I think that the gentleman should be willing to go along in a reasonable way with these low-income farmers until Congress has an opportunity to consider and adopt basic legislation. That is all the gentleman from Georgia has in mind doing, that is, holding the agency together and protecting the interests of the Government as well as these low-income families pending final determination by the Congress.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I understand the committee the gentleman speaks of had hearings all last summer, and traveled all over the country at considerable expense. Here it is the following June and only last Saturday they brought a bill in.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It was not the fault of the Cooley committee that it was so long in bringing out a bill.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It was the fault of the Committee on Agriculture which made the complaint about lack of authorization before the Rules Committee. The Cooley committee was denied support from the Agricultural Committee up until last Saturday when they reported this bill. There is no more excuse for rehabilitating people today in wartime, when jobs are plentiful and wages good. Prices are good. A chairman of our Appropriation Committee used to say if the House of Representatives is not going to hold things down, if it is not going to watch the Federal Treasury, who is going to do it? If you Members who are going into the campaign shortly, Republicans and Democrats alike, maintaining that you are for abolishing bureaus, pray tell me when you are going to begin if you do not begin on Farm Security? That is one that is due to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I can agree with so much that has been said by my genial associate from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. There is, however, a different situation with which we must contend at the moment. Farm security has outstanding hundreds of millions of dollars in loans. That is money which belongs to the taxpayers of the United States of America that has been loaned to Farm Security clients. Those funds must be administered. We can throw Farm Security out of the window today, but if we do, this function of administering those loans, collecting the principal and interest installments thereof, must be handled by some agency of the Government. You might transfer it to the Farm Credit Administration, but that would require legislation, and that is not before us today. We can either maintain F. S. A. for another year or create a new agency to perform this function.

What is before us is simply this: It is a proposal to carry this operation on for one more year, and in carrying it on for another year, we have undertaken to cut down the administrative funds and to reduce the loan fund as well.

Let me give you a picture of what has been done, in economizing on this operation in recent years.

I believe I can address myself to this with some modesty because the House knows quite well that I have been a very consistent critic of Farm Security Administration. I have opposed many of its activities from the very outset as one of the tragic creatures of an Executive order. It has floundered around the wilderness of Washington without legislative authority and here in all its nakedness today we see what happens when with such facility a huge organization is created by a stroke of the pen in the form of a Presidential order. So we have to wrestle with the problem.

I have undertaken to get these funds reduced over the years. In 1942 their administrative funds were in round figures $71,000,000. In 1943 it had dropped from $71,000,000 to $42,000,000. In 1944 it dropped from $42,000,000 to $30,000,000. In 1945 we finally agreed on $28,500,000, but in conference we cut that down another $2,500,000. So we are going to report by action of the conference committee $26,000,000 for grants, rehabilitation funds and so forth. That is a reduction from $71,000,000 in 1942 to $26,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945. Frankly, therefore, we have made some progress in that field. I can agree that even more progress can be made in the interest of efficiency and economy.

Let us consider for a moment this question of loans. In 1942 we authorized F. S. A. to make $120,000,000 in loans. Then the battle began. I tried to get that reduced on occasions by $30,000,000 but did not succeed. In 1943, however, it dropped to $97,500,000. In 1944 the committee reduced the loan authorization by $30,000,000 to $67,500,000. When the Department of Agriculture went before the Bureau of the Budget this year for its fiscal 1945 estimates it asked for $125,000,000 for loan funds. The Budget Bureau sliced that to $97,500,000, which is a reduction of approximately $27,500,000. When it came to our subcommittee in the House we reduced it another $30,000,000 to $67,500,000. Another very great deliberative body, which is a part of the coordinate legislative structure, in its composite wisdom decided that should be increased by $30,000,000.

When we went to conference, the F. S. A. item caused considerable discussion between House and Senate and for a time it appeared that agreement or compromise was impossible. At long last, an agreement was reached. I think we came out with some glory to ourselves, because we reduced the administrative funds another $2,500,000 and we reduced the loan fund by $30,000,000. The motion that will be made by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, in pursuance of our agreement will be to concur with an amendment reducing the administrative fund to $26,000,000 and the loan fund to $67,500,000.

Now, a word or two about the Farm Security operation generally. I hope before you go home for recess that you will secure a very interesting document. It is House Report No. 1430, Union Calendar No. 492. It is a report submitted by the committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and is dated May 9, 1944. The reason this is so interesting to me is because through the years my genial friend from North Carolina and I have been respectively protagonist and antagonist on this whole Farm Security matter, and for that matter in the field of farm tenancy. He was a very worthy foe on this floor.

My friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and I used to debate on this floor as to how much or how little Farm Security should have. He used to chide me in reference to statements I would make about this agency. So it is interesting to read the Cooley report. It carries assertions that I never would have dared to have made on this floor about the Farm Security Administration. As an example, for instance, I read to you from this report:

> The Farm Security Administration was financing communistic resettlement projects, where the families could never own homes or be paid for all that they made or for all the time they worked, and was supervising its borrowers to the extent of telling the borrower how to raise his children, how to plan his home life and, it is strongly suspected in some cases, how to vote. Some families were "kept on the Government" indefinitely, while other families that were willing to work just as hard and do their best to pay their debt, would not get any help from the Government at all.

Further in this report it says:

> It is dangerous to the continuation of the essential features of the Farm Security Administration program to let the entire operation continue as heretofore.

The report continues:

> By legal interpretations placed upon certain language contained in the several appropriation acts providing funds for the agency, the officials of the Farm Security Administration continued to operate an ever-expanding land-acquisition program under which it illegally acquired title to and possession of hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land, a very large part of which is not now occupied or in cultivation.

In this report it says:

> Families have been colonized, regimented, and supervised to an extent which cannot possibly be justified.

In this report it says:

> They (Farm Security Administration) established, maintained, and operated communities and villages in rural and suburban areas; built and maintained streets, roads, and highways; shops, stores, and warehouses; hotels and inns; recreational halls and community houses and playgrounds and other places of amusement. They built power plants and water systems. They built hospitals and rest homes, sewage-disposal plants and irrigation systems.

And so forth. I did not say that. The committee that was authorized by this House to make a thorough investigation has finally probed the situation and given the intolerable facts not only to the Congress but to the country as well. I am glad that job is done, and I take off my hat to the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD COOLEY, for coming up with such a great, courageous report.

There is one other matter I want to allude to. It was brought by my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. He spoke of the provision in the Pace bill relating to medical care. I quite agree with the gentleman from Kansas about it. Here is the language. It astounded me, I am frank to say, and I am very much disturbed about this language in the present bill. It talks about medical care, and then it says:

> That no part of such sums—

Meaning the sums that are appropriated for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation—

> be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as State laws are complied with, except that this provision shall not be applicable to the promotion or aid of a program of medical care where a majority of the participants within the program group elect to confine their choice of practitioners to a list of available licensed practitioners selected by them.

When they make an agreement with a group of medical practitioners, everybody in the group who would get the advantage of this low-cost care must have one of the doctors on whom the group has agreed. What has become of the "four freedoms"? It is, of course, easy to say he can go outside and find a doctor of his choice and pay him. True; but this program is being set up for low-income families so that they might have the benefit of low-cost medical care. You put a collective tag on it and say it is all right if you take the doctor that the group selects for you. When this right of the choice of a practitioner is limited, and when an individual can obtain low-cost medical care only if he abides by the selection of practitioners, have we not ventured well into the field of social medicine? That is what the gentleman was referring to.

That item, however, is not in issue in the pending bill, and I allude to it only because it will become of increasing interest in the days ahead.

I hope the Members will support the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, because it is the best we can do under the circumstances. It will then become the responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture to report a legislative bill dealing with the Farm Security Administration. I hope that it will occur in the near future and that the rather loose farm-credit structure which has developed in recent years can be coordinated and made more effective from the administrative standpoint.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind and gracious words concerning the work of the select committee investigating the Farm Security Administration. That committee is composed of Mr. FLANNAGAN, of Virginia; Mr. ZIMMERMAN, of Missouri; Mr. PACE, of Georgia; Mr. HOPE, of Kansas; Mr. ANTON JOHNSON, of Illinois, and Mr. ROSS RIZLEY, of Oklahoma.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. With such an indictment coming from the gentleman's committee representing the membership of the House, why should we not immediately start to liquidate such a program?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. The reason I am taking the floor at this time is to say that this committee has worked diligently in connection with its authority under House Resolution 119. We visited typical projects in all sections of the country, and we conferred with officials in county, State, and regional offices.

In the bill which we reported last Saturday we have provided for the immediate liquidation of every objectionable project which has been administered by Farm Security.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When will that bill be reported?

Mr. COOLEY. The bill is now before the Committee on Rules, and I assume that the Chairman of the Committee on Rules will accord us an opportunity to appear for the purpose of requesting a rule at some date in the near future. I had hoped that we might get the bill out before the recess, but I doubt it very much. Every member of the committee is anxious for an early consideration of the measure so that we may correct all of the evil practices which have been carried on by Farm Security in the past.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman if the committee found any traces of political activity on the part of the administrators in the various regions, in connection with the Farm Security program.

Mr. COOLEY. It was difficult for us to single out anything that could be called political activity, but such accusations have been made against the agency in the past, as the gentleman knows, and for us to find that any of the personnel of F. S. A. had engaged in political activities was a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman should be complimented for his efforts to bring out the facts, but I do think it should appear in the RECORD that though some of this money has not been too well spent, which nearly everyone will agree with me on, yet the rural people did receive, in many cases, much benefit from the money that was spent in a correct manner, and at the same time that these few dollars were being spent for these rural people, our city cousins were building homes costing on the average from $4,900 to $6,900.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. Although much money has been wasted by the agency, I think that the farm people have received some benefit from it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHORT. Can the gentleman inform the House what percentage of these loans have been repaid? Has the gentleman any figures on that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have figures on that.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] says that he has the figures. Of course, they differ in different sections of the country. Collections in some parts of the country have been better than in other sections.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The over-all payments for the United States as a whole on the production loans or the rehabilitation loans are 86.7 percent. The Bankhead-Jones loans are over 99 percent.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What is talked about concerning Farm Security most of the time are certain things about which many Members have objected, which the gentleman's bill, as he has pointed out, would end. But I would like to hear some debate on the main work of making loans to enable poor farm families to continue.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to have an opportunity to debate that proposition, but my time is limited. I would like to say this on behalf of the committee, that we have conscientiously tried to stop the land-acquisition program.

I know that every member of the committee has opposed the Federal Government's going into the land business. This agency, in many instances, without any authority of law has acquired and has control of approximately 2,000,000 acres of farm land in America. All the members of the select committee are opposed to further acquisitions of farm land by the F. S. A., and we are sure that no other lands will be acquired. I hope that the bill we have recommended will be considered at an early date.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the good thing about the Tarver amendment that has been offered is that it is not so bad as the Senate amendment. On the other hand, I do not believe we ought to go on with the Farm Security Administration at all. I believe it ought to be immediately liquidated.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia presents this picture: $67,500,000 for new loans, so-called rehabilitation loans, and $26,000,000 for expenses. This means administrative expenses totaling 39 percent. The set-up this year is $67,500,000, with $30,786,000, or 45 percent, for expenses. That is the kind of picture it presents, to loan $67,500,000 with $26,000,000 of expense.

Someone asked about the amount of loans that had been repaid. The total loans as of December 31 last were $809,000,000. The repayments were $443,000,000. The 86 percent comes in this way, that 86 percent of the amount of the matured principal has been repaid, but the way that has been brought about, as appears from all sorts of investigations, is that they have made new loans to the borrowers to cover these maturities. That is the way they keep the percentages of collections up. It is one of the most ridiculous things. You cannot tell very much about the way these things go, but on page 972 of the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill there appear the operations of this set-up on the farm tenancy business, and I am going to read you the figures as to two States:

New Jersey: Maturities, $19,000. Payments on principal, $8,800. Amount of principal and interest in default, $989. Anybody subtracting $8,800 from $19,000 gets a little over $10,000.

New York: $114,000 maturities. Payments on principal, $69,000. Then over in the column of delinquencies is $4,600. So that you cannot tell a thing from the reports of this agency. That is the kind of an agency I do not like to see continued.

In my district they have people running around soliciting farmers to take loans of that kind, which the farmers do not want. They are a menace. They went to one fellow last year and asked him to take a loan to put in fresh vegetables. They told him he would not have to pay it if he did not get a good crop. He did not get any crop, due to weather conditions, and they came around and annoyed him to death for 3 or 4 months trying to collect it, when they had represented to him that they would not ask for it. That is the way they have done business. That is the reason I do not

like to have that kind of an organization running around loose. It is a menace to the American Government to have that kind of an approach.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think that particular practice has traveled all over the country, but we cannot hold the Farm Security Administration accountable for that particular practice because they were handling it for the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation in connection with those nonrecourse loans.

Mr. TABER. Nobody has to conduct that kind of an operation unless he wants to. I do not conduct it and I do not approve of it, and I do not intend to vote for it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In connection with the observation made by the gentleman from New York regarding the administration cost, may I call the attention of the House to the fact that this agency is administering assets of the value of approximately $1,000,000,000?

Mr. TARVER. I had intended to do that. If the gentleman will wait until I can conclude my remarks, if he then feels there is anything I have omitted to mention, I shall be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I think I have been as critical of the conduct of the affairs of the Farm Security Administration as any Member of this House. An examination of the hearings of the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations for the last several years will disclose that fact. I have participated with my fellow members of that subcommittee in the attempted correction of some of these practices which we regard as bad practices. You will find some of the limitations, which have brought about some corrections, included in the amendment which we are asking the House to approve at this time.

We have attempted to bring about the liquidation of all these so-called cooperative projects, which now number 151. Some progress, but not enough progress, has been made along that line.

There are many particulars in which the administrative activities of those who have been in charge of the Farm Security Administration work could be legitimately and properly criticized. However, after all is said, it seems to me that the person who approaches the consideration of this subject in an impartial way must recognize the fact that this organization has accomplished a great deal of good for the low-income farmers of the United States. It is the one organization of the Department of Agriculture which is devoted to the interests of the poor man. In my judgment, it ought to be shorn of those things which have brought about justified criticism by the enactment of appropriate legislation by Congress when the legislative bill from the Committee on Agriculture comes before us for attention. But in the meantime we are faced with a practical situation, requiring dealing in an intelligent way with a very great problem of the Government.

The Government has outstanding loans made under the Farm Security Administration at this time of approximately $385,000,000, if my recollection of the evidence is correct, and of the administrative expense which was provided by Congress for the present fiscal year, something over $23,000,000, was provided for the administration and the collection of loans which had already been made, and only slightly in excess of $4,000,000 was provided for administrative expenses for the purpose of making new loans. We have by this proposed amendment which I have offered by the direction of my conferees proposed to reduce the administrative expenses still further, to $26,000,000 from a total of $28,000,000-plus which has been estimated by the Budget, and only a minor portion of that $26,000,000 will be available for the purpose of making new loans. Most of it will be for the purpose of administering loans already made and for looking after the interests of the Government and insuring their collection.

The gentlemen of the House will probably remember some time ago we announced in the House that we had postponed the conference with the Senate on the Agricultural Department appropriation bill until the House took action on the Pace bill to determine what disposition it desired to make of the school-lunch question and of the Farm Security Administration question and that we would feel bound by the action of the House, whatever it might be, and that if the House declined to approve either of those programs, we should, of course, decline to bring in a recommendation that an appropriation be made for them; yet, on the other hand, if the House approved these programs, we would consider that as an instruction to us to take action on the conference committee in accordance with the action which had been taken by the House. So on June 1 the House considered the Pace bill and considered the amendments to the Pace bill and adopted amendments authorizing for 1 year the school-lunch program and the Farm Security Administration program. So we brought in the exact language which the House had approved on June 1 for this school-lunch program with the exact authorization which the House had approved. On yesterday, without objection, this House approved our amendment proposing to authorize that program exactly as the House had approved it on the 1st day of June. We have done the same thing with regard to the Farm Security Administration program. You authorized without any dissenting voice on the 1st day of June in connection with the Pace bill the continuance of this program as it has been carried on for the present fiscal year for another year.

Now the Senate had provided funds largely in excess of those which had been made available for the present fiscal year, but in accordance with what we conceived to be the instruction of the House, we insisted that those funds be reduced to amounts available for the present fiscal year and in the case of administrative expenses we insisted on a further cut below the amount of funds made available for the present fiscal year. We have brought this matter before you in substantially the way in which you approved it on the 1st day of June, and we think without regard to how you feel about the Farm Security Administration or what should be done with it, you should approve the action of your subcommittee in doing exactly what you in effect instructed us to do. All of the members of our subcommittee, both Republicans and Democrats, have approved this action, with the exception of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The difference between the approval of the Farm Security Administration on June 1 and the lunch program was that the lunch program was talked about for an hour and the Farm Security item was put over and nobody asked questions on it in particular.

Mr. TARVER. No; the Farm Security Administration provision was not slipped over. I was present in the House. Was the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] present?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; I was not.

Mr. TARVER. Then the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is not in a position to say it was slipped over. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture, was present and was sitting at the table where the gentleman is standing now. The matter was called up and no Member of the House who was present saw fit to object to the adoption of the amendment adopted in the Pace bill and which we have proposed here in accordance with what we construe to be the will of the House. Of course, if the gentleman had objections to that amendment he had the right to be present and raise those objections.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As the gentleman knows, I favor the continuation of the Farm Security for a year, pending complete investigation of the Farm Credit structure, with the hope that we can consolidate all these agencies under one head. But in looking over the figures that the committee has submitted here for land-purchase the thought occurs to me that really, this is no time to put these farm tenants on high-priced land.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, but we do not carry a thing in this bill for the purchase of land, that is, for the Farm Security Administration, except in the farm tenant land-purchase program, which is a different item. There is not a dollar of this money that can be used for the purchase of land.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, the Farm Security Administration is administering the farm tenant land purchases.

Mr. TARVER. That is true, but that is another item. That is not this item of the bill. That item has already been agreed to. In fact, the House had in the bill when it passed the House, the $15,000,000 for the farm tenant land-purchase program and this item does not provide anything for the purchase of land, but on the contrary it has an express inhibition against the use of this money for the purchase of land. I call the gentleman's attention to this language:

"None of the moneys provided or authorized under this caption, 'loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program."

Not a dollar of this money, if it is approved by the House, can be used for the purchase of land.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the attitude of the committee, and I want to compliment the committee for taking that position.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another minute in order to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how many farmers is it estimated that the Farm Security Administration aids or has aided, say in the past fiscal year, approximately?

Mr. TARVER. I do not know the current figures, but it is something in the neighborhood of a million farmers since the beginning of the program. I think there are about 376,000 at the present time. And they are the poorest farmers in the United States. Unfortunately the poorer farmers are in the majority, at least in my part of the country, and I think perhaps that is true of the gentleman's district also.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The administrative expenses have been cut over $2,500,000?

Mr. TARVER. That is, below the Senate bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; and you have cut the Senate's proposal of loans from $97,000,000 down to $67,000,000?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct, to $67,500,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Are any members of the gentleman's committee, on the conference committee of the House, opposed to the gentleman's motion as he has submitted it?

Mr. TARVER. None, except the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], as I understand it. So far as the amount involved is concerned, may I say to the gentleman, while the Pace amendment authorized the appropriation in such amounts as might be thought necessary by Congress, at the same time the language of the amendment seemed to indicate that Congress desired the program carried on for the next fiscal year substantially as it had been carried on for this fiscal year. It is largely for that reason that we did not consent to recommend additional money.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAMBERTSON) there were—ayes 133, noes 22.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 68: On page 84, line 11, strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 68.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 71: On page 86, line 22, after the figures, insert: "which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 71.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the various votes by which action has been taken in connection with the conference report, and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 and upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 40, 53, 63, and 65, that a further conference with the Senate be requested, and that the Speaker appoint the conferees on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WINTER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CORRECTION OF THE ROLL CALL

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 98, I am recorded as absent. I was present and voted "yea," and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD and Journal will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a luncheon address at the Inter-American Bar Association by Col. William C. Rigby. I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office that this article will cost $182.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD it is indicated that I was one of three Members who objected to a bill introduced by myself. I would like to have the RECORD corrected to indicate that the other objector was the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] with whom I have conferred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction may be made.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the shortage of oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech delivered by Mr. Shaughnessey, of the Department of Immigration and Naturalization, on I Am an American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. LUCE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects and to include in each certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, General Saunders, who led the B-29 raid on Japan recently, is a citizen of South Dakota, of whom we are all very proud. I ask unanimous consent to insert a newspaper article telling of his activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with regard to House Joint Resolution 93, which was passed yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by the Governor of Pennsylvania, Hon. Edward Martin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered at Atlantic City on Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1634. An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1432) entitled "An act to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939"; agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. BREWSTER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of War.
3. Selective Service System.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1718) entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes"; agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. Administration Office of United States Courts (U. S. District Court, District of Maryland).
8. Civil Service Commission.
9. Federal Works Agency.
10. Selective Service System.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House, June 17, 1944.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is unnecessary for me to make an extended statement at this time with reference to the action of the conferees, but I do think the Members of the House would like to know about what action was taken concerning the 208 amendments in dispute between the two Houses. I believe the House would also like to know whether or not we are under Budget estimates or over the Budget estimates, so I will give just a few figures and then yield briefly to the ranking minority member and other members of the committee who wish to make brief statements.

Mr. Speaker, as recommended by the House conferees the bill totals $103,293,796.36. This is a reduction in the Budget estimate of $12,080,599. This the conferees feel is a very satisfactory showing.

The net reduction in the bill as it was passed by the Senate is more than $20,000,000, to be exact, $20,389,549.

The net increase in the bill over the amount it carried as passed by the House is $15,000,000, but in that connection it should be remembered that after the bill left the House more than $18,000,000 of Budget estimates went to the Senate.

The Senate has receded on 103 out of a total of 208 amendments. That is something very unusual, it is unusual for them to recede on half as many amendments, and we feel we have made an excellent showing in persuading them to

78th Congress } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Report
2d Session } { No. 1714

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

June 22, 1944.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Tarver, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4443]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 60:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

: Provided further, That no part of any funds available to the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department or Administration shall be used in the fiscal year 1945 for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the War Food Administration or any of its constituent agencies shall be paid out

for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person after it is determined by the War Food Administrator that such person has, personally or by letter, demanded that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity. Hearings on charges filed with the War Food Administrator shall be held and decision made within thirty days after such charges are filed with him

And the Senate agree to the same.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
M. E. TYDINGS,
E. D. SMITH,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House had inserted two provisos, one of which prohibited the use of funds appropriated for the Department to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political or lobbying activity, and the other of which denied the use of funds to pay the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person who demands that a farmer join the Triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.

In the conference, substitute language was adopted prohibiting the use, during the fiscal year 1945, of funds available to the Department for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person convicted of violating the so-called Hatch Act or found to have violated the provisions of the so-called antilobbying statute, which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

In lieu of the so-called Harness amendment, the conference agreed upon language directed against the same abuses as set forth in the original provision but denying the use of the funds appropriated for the War Food Administration for the salary and expenses of only such persons as are found, by the War Food Administrator, to have indulged in such abuses and directing that hearings on charges filed with the Administrator shall be held and decision made within 30 days after such charges are filed with him.

M. C. Tarver,
Clarence Cannon,
Harry R. Sheppard,
Elmer H. Wene,
W. P. Lambertson,
John Taber,
Managers on the part of the House.

O

sources, that the Securities and Exchange Act makes equity financing of small businesses practically impossible. That act should be examined with the view to retaining its salutary provisions and eliminating those that make the floating of new small security issues so troublesome and expensive that they are practically prohibited. The study might well be extended to all other practices that are restrictive upon the financing of new equity issues.

Mr. President, this is one of the few subjects on the calendar for post-war planning to which no attention has as yet been given, although, in my opinion, it is of basic importance. I think the testimony is highly convincing, and the experience of the country is persuasive to the thought that the existing rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission are so ponderous and even so imponderable that the formation of small corporations has practically become a financial impossibility because of the burdens involved. Since on all sides we are putting our emphasis upon the necessity of encouraging small business, I think it is very essential that a study of this particular problem should proceed with the least possible delay.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution calling upon and directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make this study as soon as possible. I feel certain that it relates in a most important and essential way to the post-war economic planning program.

I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution (S. Res. 316) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas the formation of new business enterprises and the expansion of existing business enterprises, especially in the case of small business, is esential to the maintenance of a sound and prosperous economy during the post-war period and should be facilitated and encouraged by every reasonable means; and

Whereas it appears that the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and of the laws administered by such Commission, impose burdens which substantially restrict the formation and financing of small business enterprises: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and of the laws administered by such Commission, with a view to providing for the revision and simplification of the requirements of such Commission and such laws in such a manner as to facilitate and encourage the formation and expansion of business enterprises, particularly in the case of small business, and, at the same time, provide adequate protection for investors. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TWELFTH BIMONTHLY REPORT OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Twelfth Bimonthly Report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, covering the period April 1, 1944, through May 31, 1944, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON THE AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, some question has arisen as to the composition of the conferees on the part of the Senate on House bill 4443, the agricultural appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair add to the conferees who have heretofore been appointed on the bill the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from Orgeon [Mr. HOLMAN].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ERNEST JOSEPH DAWLEY TO BE A BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE ARMY—RECONSIDERATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the nomination of Ernest Joseph Dawley, to be a brigadier general (temporary) in the Army of the United States, which was acted upon last evening by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the motion will be entered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the President be requested to return the notice of confirmation to the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, is is so ordered.

ILLINOIS FARMING IN WARTIME—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject Illinois Farming in Wartime, which appears in the Appendix.]

LATIN-AMERICA RESENTFUL—ARTICLE BY BAINBRIDGE COLBY

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Latin-America Resentful," written by Hon. Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GRAND JOB OF OUR CENTURY—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Grand Job of Our Century," delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, at the commencement exercises at the College of the City of New York, on June 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MARSHALL FIELD BEFORE THE CAPITAL PRESS CLUB

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Marshall Field before the Capital Press Club at Washington, D. C., on June 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DOMESTIC POLITICAL FRONT—ADDRESS BY FRANK KINGDON

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed a radio address delivered by Frank Kingdon on June 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INSURANCE OR DOLES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Insurance or Doles," from the Washington Post of June 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WALTER WHITE ON HIS RECENT TRIP ABROAD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of conditions affecting American Negro soldiers abroad, delivered by Walter White, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, on April 30, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5040, the second deficiency appropriation bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5040) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1944, and June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General Appropriations—Legislative", on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to expend from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate, fiscal year 1945, the necessary amount to increase to $4,100 per annum, beginning July 1, 1944, and so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, the clerkship in his office, at $3,600 per annum provided for in

the Legislative Branch and Judiciary Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

For the payment of 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at $4 per day each, for the period July 1, 1944, to December 31, 1944, both dates inclusive, $15,456.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

Reporting Senate proceedings: For an additional amount for reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, fiscal year 1944, $2,494.83.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 22, to insert:

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

For an amount, which is hereby authorized, to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $10,000, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half by the Clerk of the House on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 7, to insert:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Books for the adult blind: For an additional sum to enable the Librarian of Congress to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931 (2 U. S. C. 135a), as amended, fiscal year 1945, $130,000, no part of which shall be available for payments for personal services or traveling expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Office of Price Administration," on page 9, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$100,000"; and, in line 22, after the numerals "1945", to strike out "$177,750,000" and insert "$182,252,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 20, after the words "types of", to strike out "a commodity" and insert "processed fruits and vegetables."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I expect momentarily some material on that amendment. I ask that it go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I join in the request that the amendment go over for the present. Let the clerk proceed with the amendments following it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent executive agencies," on page 14, after line 9, to insert:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1945, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1945, $2,680,000, which amount, together with the appropriation to which added, shall be available for all expenses necessary for administering the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and the Panama Canal construction annuity fund (act of May 29, 1944, Public Law 319).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 18, to insert:

Panama Canal construction annuity fund: For payment of annuities authorized by the act of May 29, 1944 (Public Law 319), fiscal year 1945, $1,500,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Roads Administration," on page 18, line 6, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 212, and"; and in line 8, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$85,862.49" and insert "$100,564.18."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to insert:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: The appropriation for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1944, shall be available for not to exceed $1,660,440 for traveling expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," on page 23, after line 19, to insert:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For an additional amount for the establishment of air-navigation facilities, fiscal year 1945, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, $1,108,000: *Provided*, That said amount shall be available for the establishment of landing areas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department and Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary," on page 30, line 4, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 214, and"; and in line 6, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$18,726.33" and insert "$30,563.09."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 5, to insert:

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Medical Department: The appropriation "Medical Department," for the fiscal year 1945 shall be available for the manufacture or production of products by patients in naval hospitals and other naval medical facilities incident to their convalescence and rehabilitation, and ownership thereof shall be vested in the patients manufacturing or producing such products, except that the ownership of such items manufactured or produced specifically for the use of a naval hospital or other naval medical facility shall be vested in the Government and such items shall be accounted for and disposed of accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast Guard," on page 33, line 3, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 216, and"; and in line 5, to strike out "$550" and insert "$632.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 5, to insert:

PRINTING AND BINDING

The limitation of $8,500,000 under the appropriation "Printing and binding, Navy Department," contained in the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1945, on the amount of printing and binding executed at the Government Printing Office which may be procured with funds appropriated for the Naval Establishment, shall not apply to technical and instructional printing and publications.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department," on page 34, after line 9, to insert:

OFFICE OF CHIEF INSPECTOR

Salaries of inspectors: For an additional amount for salaries of inspectors, fiscal year 1944, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 34, line 17, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$1,820,000" and insert "$2,131,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 36, after line 8, to insert:

Operating force, public buildings: For an additional amount for operating force, public buildings, maintenance and operation, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1944, $136,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Civil functions—Corps of Engineers," on page 40, after line 21, to insert:

The appropriations for rivers and harbors shall be available for the improvement, in the interest of national defense and subject to the approval of the Chief of Engineers, of the channel in the Withlacoochee River, Fla., between its mouth and Inglis.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Damage claims," on page 41, line 21, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 215, and"; and in line 22, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$64,456.76" and insert "$176,675.26."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Judgments and authorized claims—Property damage claims," on page 43, after line 12, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent establishments, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sum not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 208, Seventy-eighth Congress, as follows:

Executive Office of the President:

Office for Emergency Management:

Division of Central Administrative Services, $28.35;

Federal Security Agency, $598.99;

Federal Works Agency, $277.34;

National Housing Agency, $67.05;

that you would submit to me the charges and papers on which my testimony would be based and accorded me the privilege of having with me Mr. Zincke, who is the general counsel for the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I shall be glad to have the information so as to fortify myself as much as possible on these charges. I do not know how extended the cross-examination may be, for generally speaking, I have no hesitancy in saying that nothing in the investigation of which I have a knowledge imputes moral turpitude or gross negligence to Admiral Land. Of course, with the volume of matters coming to his attention, it would be impossible for a man occupying his position to know intimately all details.

Personally, I shall be delighted to do everything I can for Admiral Land. I think that it is fortunate that we have such a man in his position. I think he is serving at a sacrifice and could make much more money on the outside than he is making. I believe that with all his faults, admitting that he has some, he has done an excellent job and we are much nearer to victory than we would have been without Admiral Land's work. If I can help in any way to secure for him what he desires, I should be delighted to have you call on me.

Mr. Zincke is at present in New York and I shall not be able to see him until he returns the first of next week to ascertain if he has made any engagements for next week. I should be delighted to help in every way I can.

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND.

Please call on me whenever I can serve you.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropraitions for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department or Administration shall be used in the fiscal year 1945 for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the War Food Administration or any of its constituent agencies shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person after it is determined by the War Food Administrator that such person has, personally or by letter, demanded that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity. Hearings on charges filed with the War Food Administrator shall be held and decision made within thirty days after such charges are filed with him"; and the Senate agree to the same.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
M. E. TYDINGS,
E. D. SMITH,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
WALLACE H. WHITE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement in regard to this matter. The only amendment in disagreement in the agricultural appropriations bill, or the only amendment on which final action had not been completed was the so-called political activity amendment which was inserted in the bill in the House, and was stricken out in the Senate on a yea-and-nay vote.

The conferees have discussed this matter on two or three occasions. The Senate conferees had taken the position that it was unfair to single out any one department of the Government and to impose upon the personnel of that department limitations and restrictions which did not apply with uniformity to the personnel of all other departments and agencies of Government.

Mr. President, we were unable to sustain our position. The amendment which has been reported by the clerk represents a compromise of the House provision.

The Senate will recall that in the discussion of the House provision it was pointed out that the words "political activity" were rather broad. The amendment which was before the Senate originally as it came from the other House was very broad, and did not undertake to define political activities. The compromise amendment agreed to this morning does undertake to define political activities, but relates them to the terms of the Hatch Act. It provides that any person who has been found guilty of violating the Hatch Act shall not be allowed to draw, as compensation, any of the funds appropriated by the act.

The House amendment with reference to lobbying, and seeking to influence the action of Congress, undoubtedly could have been construed to prevent the right of petition. Under the amendment any person who so much as communicated with a Member of Congress on any subject, whether it related to the activities of the Department of Agriculture or not, could not receive any funds out of this appropriation providing the funds were to be used as compensation. The compromise relates the antilobbying provision specifically to the terms of the antilobbying statute, and provides that no person who has been found by his superior to have violated the terms of the antilobbying statute may receive any of the funds as compensation.

The greatest difficulty experienced in the conference was with regard to working out what has been called the Harness amendment, which undertakes to prescribe a penalty for supposed action on the part of local committeemen in intimidating farmers into participating in an agricultural program by the threat of withholding certificates for rationed commodities, or withholding recommendations regarding deferment of farm workers. Under the terms of the House provision each of the committeemen—and, indeed, all the field employees of the War Food Administration—would have been required each month to sign an affidavit asserting that they had not committed any of the acts which were prohibited by the limitations. The conferees changed the language so as to provide that no person shall receive any salary or overtime allowance, or any expense—that being the language of the original Harness amendment—when it is determined by the War Food Administrator that such person has undertaken to intimidate farmers in connection with the matters which are prohibited.

The language further provides that any charge which may be filed against any of the personnel must be determined by the War Food Administrator within 30 days following the filing of the charge. If any person were found to be guilty of malfeasance in office, or guilty of abuse of power, the amendment agreed upon would be much more effective than the original Harness amendment.

I may say, Mr. President, that the conference report was unanimous, and agreed to by all the conferees representing both parties who were present in the conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in this amendment. I assume that it is similar to the amendment which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Connecticut did not in any way relate to the Harness amendment. It undertook only to modify the first proviso which defined political activities. The conferees did not have a great deal of difficulty in working out that portion of it. Their greatest difficulty was in connection with the so-called Harness amendment, which related to the activities of local committeemen.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the amendment prevent sending out literature from Washington advocating participation in some program, with the understanding that if those who were solicited did not participate, certain things would take place? I did not hear all the explanation. I do not know what the Harness amendment is.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska insisted upon when the subject was formerly under discussion in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the one?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The original amendment provided that no person should receive compensation if guilty of certain alleged violations, but no provision was made for determining whether the person was guilty. The amendment agreed upon in conference provides that the War Food Administrator must make a determination within 30 days after a complaint has been filed, thereby making the language specific.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the amendment agreed to by the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was agreed to by all the conferees. I might say that in order to be sure that the rights of those interested in the Harness amendment were protected, the House conferees appointed a very able conferee who was not a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Our representation on the committee was not increased, was it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I think, however, that the action exceeded customary practices in such cases, because, as a rule, when a conferee is absent it is not customary to appoint someone to take his place merely because of his absence. As a matter of fact, three members of the majority conferees on the part of the Senate were not present this morning. They did not complain against the appointment. They were glad to have the able gentleman present.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the Senator for the consideration given the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am referring to the action of the House and not of the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was quite difficult to follow the early statements of the Senator from Georgia, because of numerous conferences taking place in the Chamber. Am I correct in my understanding that the subject to which the able Senator from Georgia addressed himself is with reference to the appropriation bill dealing with agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the prohibition as to political activities deal with some particular agency?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does. I believe that the Senator from West Virginia was present when the matter was under discussion in the first instance. He will recall that the House had appended a long limitation to the agricultural bill which undertook to limit political activities of employees of the Agriculture Department. The amendment now under consideration is the one which grew out of that situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would any political activity be prohibited?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; except the undefined political activity referred to in the original House provision. The conference committee sought to limit it to the political activity defined in the Hatch Act. The original language of the House amendment applied to any person who engaged in political activity, including, but not limited to, certain acts. The question was raised that such language might even prohibit a man from voting. So we undertook to resort to a statutory definition of political activity which prohibits activity in political campaigns, or the solicitation of subscriptions for any political campaign, or the solicitation of subscriptions to any publication which might be issued in connection with a political campaign.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for the courtesy which he showed the minority in connection with this matter. It is true that originally there were two Republican conferees appointed to the conference. One of those Members was absent when the committee met. The Senator from Georgia very courteously consented to the addition of two Republican Members to act as members of the conference committee, and those Members participated in reaching a final agreement with respect to the so-called political section. The language agreed upon is, to be sure, a compromise. It does not go so far as some Members would wish it to go, but it takes a long step forward in the direction which some of us on this side of the Chamber and some on the other side of the Chamber are anxious to see taken. I feel sure that the result is the best that could be worked out, and I hope the Senate as a whole will indicate its approval.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his statement. I may say that the action of the conference committee represents a compromise in that the Senate yielded considerable of its position taken by a recorded vote on a former occasion. I thank the Senator for his reference to the conferees.

I wish to say that ever since I have handled this bill my primary aim, insofar as committee operation is concerned, has been to avoid anything in the agricultural appropriation bill that might in the slightest degree partake of any partisan action. As a rule, the question of party among the membership of the subcommittee has never created a cleavage within the committee. We have proceeded on the idea that American agriculture was not a partisan matter, because there are Republican farmers and Democratic farmers and Socialist farmers. There has never been any partisanship in the committee, and I regretted very much when this matter was appended to this bill and so stated on the floor of the Senate at the time the amendment was pending—it was put in by the House—because it was calculated to draw a line of party cleavage. I hope we will never have another matter of that kind before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to express my thanks to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was very happy that the Senator from Maine called my attention to it. I told him that he could name any representative he desired, and, if there were any members of the subcommittee who were absent, he could name any member of the full committee who was not a member of the subcommittee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1749) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2472) for the relief of the estate of Gertrude Mullins.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 21, and 31 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14 and 19 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 248. An act for the relief of Louis Courcil;

H. R. 544. An act for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay;

H. R. 1313. An act for the relief of Delores Lewis;

H. R. 1411. An act for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart;

H. R. 1412. An act for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton;

H. R. 2625. An act for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held; and

H. R. 3538. An act for the relief of Rev. James T. Denigan.

Somers, N. Y.	Talbot	Ward
Sparkman	Talle	Weaver
Spence	Tarver	Weichel, Ohio
Springer	Thomas, N. J.	Welch
Stanley	Thomas, Tex.	West
Starnes, Ala.	Thomason	Whelchel, Ga.
Stearns, N. H.	Tibbott	Whittington
Stefan	Tolan	Wickersham
Stevenson	Torrens	Wigglesworth
Stigler	Towe	Willey
Stockman	Troutman	Wilson
Sullivan	Vincent, Ky.	Winter
Sumner, Ill.	Vinson, Ga.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sumners, Tex.	Vorys, Ohio	Woodrum, Va.
Sundstrom	Wadsworth	Zimmerman
Taber	Walter	

NAYS—56

Anderson, N. Mex.	Fulmer	Norton
Bloom	Furlong	O'Brien, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Burchill, N. Y.	Gorski	O'Toole
Burgin	Hart	Outland
Byrne	Holifield	Pace
Cannon, Mo.	Jackson	Poage
Capozzoli	Kee	Rooney
Celler	Kelley	Rowan
Cochran	Keogh	Rowe
Coffee	King	Russell
Delaney	Kirwan	Sadowski
Dickstein	LaFollette	Scanlon
Dingell	Lane	Sheppard
Eberharter	Lesinski	Snyder
Fogarty	Lynch	Voorhis, Calif.
Folger	Madden	Weiss
Forand	Marcantonio	Wene
	Myers	Wright

NOT VOTING—101

Andrews, N. Y.	Gearhart	Merrow
Arnold	Gibson	Miller, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Mills
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Morrison, N. C.
Barry	Gillespie	Mruk
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Murdock
Boren	Green	Murphy
Boykin	Hagen	O'Connor
Bradley, Mich.	Hale	Patman
Bulwinkle	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Ga.
Burdick	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Camp	Harris, Va.	Plumley
Canfield	Hébert	Pratt, Joseph M.
Cannon, Fla.	Heidinger	Rabaut
Carrier	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Chiperfield	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Johnson, Calvin D.	Sasscer
Compton	Johnson, Luther A.	Sauthoff
Costello	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scott
Cox	Kearney	Shafer
Davis	Kennedy	Sheridan
Dawson	Kilburn	Slaughter
Dies	Klein	Stewart
Dilweg	Landis	Taylor
Dirksen	Lemke	Treadway
Disney	Lewis	Vursell
Douglas	Luce	Wasielewski
Elmer	McCord	White
Fay	McMurray	Whitten
Fish	Magnuson	Winstead
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Tex.	Wolcott
Ford	Merritt	Wolverton, N. J.
Fulbright		Woodruff, Mich.
Fuller		Worley
Gavin		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Dilweg for, with Mr. Sauthoff against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Fitzpatrick against.

Mr. Fulbright for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. McMurray against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Fay against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Elmer.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Carrier.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Joseph M. Pratt.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Stewart with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Green with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Hagen with Mr. Lemke.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Mruk.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a telegram from the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] resigning as a conferee on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Without objection, the resignation is accepted, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is appointed in his stead.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of this action.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT BILL OF 1944

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The differences between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following statement, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached, and minor clarifying changes.

The House amendment added the War Production Board to the agencies defined under section 3 (g) as contracting agencies. The conference agreement retains this provision.

In addition to the accountants, engineers, appraisers, and other experts which the Director under the House amendment is authorized to employ without regard to the civil-service laws, the conference agreement adds authority to appoint a Deputy Director and authority of the Director to fix the compensation of such employees.

The conference agreement retains the House floor amendment which required review of settlements in excess of $50,000 by settlement review boards within the contracting agencies. The amendment, however, would not subject to approval of such settlement review boards any arbitration award. Minor changes of clarifying nature were made in the provision and a further provision was made that failure of the settlement review board to act upon a settlement within 30 days after its submission shall operate as approval by the board.

Section 6 (d) of the House amendment enumerated various specific items of cost to be considered, to the extent allocable, and other items to be excluded, in establishing methods and standards for settling claims not settled by agreement. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The conference agreement revises this House provision to state more concisely and in more general terms the costs to be taken into account for such purpose. The conference agreement retains the enumeration in the House amendment of costs to be excluded except that item (v), dealing with costs charged off during a period covered by a previous renegotiation, is omitted to allow for flexible treatment of this item. The next paragraph of this subsection (from the House amendment) makes it clear that this omission is not intended to imply that this item should be allowed or disallowed and permits the Director to provide for the inclusion or exclusion of this and other costs in accordance with recognized commercial accounting practice.

Subsection 6 (e) of the House amendment, dealing with settlements by agreement, is retained by the conference agreement.

Section 8 (d) of the Senate bill contained a provision permitting the Director to prescribe penalties up to 6 percent for overstatements by contractors on amounts due on their claims in connection with financing, in order to protect the Government's interests. The conferees considered the provision desirable to prevent attempts to secure excessive interim financing. Accordingly, the conference agreement reinstates the provision but provides that the 6 percent penalty shall be automatic unless in the opinion of the Director the imposition thereof would be inequitable.

The House floor amendment prescribing the method for giving notice of cancelation to prime contractors and subcontractors, has been modified by section 11 (a) (2), so as to direct each contracting agency to establish procedures whereby prime contractors shall provide affected subcontractors with immediate notice of termination.

The conference agreement retains the provisions of the House amendment allowing suit in the court after resort to the appeal board, and also provides that costs of suit shall be taxed against the war contractor unless the court awards the contractor an amount in

excess of that allowed by the appeal board or panel.

The House floor amendment limiting the per annum compensation of members of the appeal board to $10,000, and limiting their terms of office to 2 years, is also retained.

The provision of section 16 (a) of the House amendment specifying the authority of the General Accounting Office to examine records maintained by any contracting agency or by any war contractor relating to any termination settlement, is retained in the conference agreement. Subsection (b) has been rewritten in conference and provides that whenever the Comptroller General is convinced that any settlement was induced by fraud, he shall so certify, together with all the facts relating thereto, to the Department of Justice, to the Director, and to the contracting agency concerned. Upon receiving such certificate (1) the Department of Justice is directed to make an investigation to determine whether the settlement was induced by fraud, and (2) until the Department of Justice notifies the contracting agency that in its opinion the facts do not support the belief that the settlement was induced by fraud, the contracting agency, by set-off or otherwise, may withhold the amount of settlement or portion thereof, which in the opinion of the Comptroller General as stated in his certificate, was affected by the fraud.

The provision of the House amendment providing for a penalty of 25 percent of any amount sought to be secured by fraud, even though such amount may not actually be received, is retained in the conference agreement.

Subsection (e) of section 19 of the House amendment added to the bill a provision making it unlawful for a person who, as a commissioned officer in the Army or the Navy or as an officer or employee of the United States, has at any time during the period from December 7, 1941, until 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, been assigned to duty by the War or Navy Departments, or employed in any agency of the Government, and been engaged on behalf of the United States in procuring or assisting to procure supplies, materials, work, or services for the Government, or engaged in settling or adjusting contracts, from accepting or soliciting employment in presenting, aiding, or assisting for compensation in the prosecution of claims against the United States arising out of any contracts for supplies, materials, or services which were pending or entered into while the officer or employee was associated therewith. A penalty of a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, was provided for any violation of the provision. Subsection (j) of the Renegotiation Act was to be noneffective after enactment of this legislation.

The conferees agreed to a substitute provision making it unlawful for any person employed in any Government agency, including commissioned officers assigned to duty in such agency during the period such person is engaged in such employment or service, to prosecute, or to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or for any such person within 2 years after the time when such employment or service has ceased, to prosecute, or to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed or performed duty. A penalty consisting of a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both, is provided for violations of this provision.

The Senate bill contained a provision requiring that officers and employees of contracting agencies aid war contractors in preparing and presenting termination claims and obtaining interim financing as a part of their official duties, and provided that such assistance should not constitute a violation of section 109 of the Criminal Code. The House amendment qualified this provision to insure that such officers and employees may not receive any benefit or compensation, directly or indirectly from the war contractors. The substance of the provisions of the House amendment were retained in the conference agreement.

The House amendment added a provision to section 20 of the bill reiterating the authority of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to make interim loans and guaranties to small business concerns. This provision is retained in the conference agreement.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
C. E. HANCOCK,
JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Managers on the part of the House.

(For conference report, see proceedings of the House of June 21, 1944.)

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has already agreed to this conference report and the part of it which has just been read gives the House a fair indication of what was agreed as between the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the report.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] withdraw his motion temporarily, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the motion temporarily.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know in what respect the House conferees yielded to the Senate and what changes were made in the bill as we passed it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, that would take a long time to explain in minute detail. Everything is fully explained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the bill agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees is essentially the bill as passed by the House. There is no important change except a few minor changes in phraseology, but essentially it is the bill as it passed the House overwhelmingly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is that the view of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is my view, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 21, 1944.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: On page 4, line 16, insert:

"Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, Department of Labor (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Labor to liquidate during the fiscal year 1945 the existing organization of the Working Conditions Service, including payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of this Service; such travel as may be necessary to the accomplishment of the said liquidation; and the termination of existing leases for office space an indeterminate amount to be derived from the unexpended and unobligated balance of the appropriation made to the Division of Labor Standards (national defense) in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, approved December 23, 1943, not exceeding $40,000."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 2.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: On page 24, line 15, insert:

"Visual aids for war training (national defense): For all necessary expenses of the Office of Education in procuring and making available, for reproduction and use, visual-aid instructional units, consisting of motion-picture films, lantern slides, slide films, and film loops, for training in occupations essential to the war effort (each such occupation to be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses; printing and binding: $207,312: *Provided*, That copies of slides and films shall be sold at a price sufficient to pay the whole cost of production of such slides and films."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the sum proposed by such amendment, insert '$175,000.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent my life in the business of insurance. In that time I have learned that the most important thing in that business, as it relates to the welfare of its policyholders as well as to its own prosperity, is the degree of competitive progress that can be made. The first duty of every insurance company and of every insurance agent is to the policyholder, and the first element in the performance of that duty is financial security. Regardless of what rate may be charged, the most important element in an insurance contract is financial security.

Under the regulation of the States for the past many, many years, there has been added to the business of insurance an additional avenue of competition. In addition to their own efforts in the broadening of forms, in the lowering of rates, or the improvement of engineering and technical and claims services, supervision by the various States has in itself, brought to the business a competitive element, because the various States have competed among themselves for improved supervision.

Time is not permitted to go on and relate the many, many instances in which one State after the other has improved its insurance code in order to attempt to be first in the field of supervision. States not alone regulate rates but they also regulate investments. The State of New York, the State of Illinois, and many other States say to the various life insurance companies of the country, "You shall invest only a certain percentage of your assets in real estate; only a certain percentage in municipal bonds; only a certain percentage in certain types of preferred stocks."

Under this decision of the Supreme Court are we to interpret that all types of regulation are thrown out of the window and that now companies may go into various types of speculation which impair their financial security?

Now let us give a little more attention to this rate structure—and here I shall explain why I disagree with the bill introduced by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for whom I have great respect. I believe the gentleman from New Mexico and I want the same thing, that is, careful State supervision of insurance and a noninterference policy on the part of the Federal Government; I believe we seek the same thing.

State regulations operate pretty much in this fashion: The State department of insurance does not actually make the rate. The various State insurance codes usually prescribe that the companies themselves shall make the rates, and that they shall put on file these rates with the State through a bureau which the companies support and finance. The minute the companies band together in order to comply with such requirements under a State code they are deemed to be in combination. The companies pool their individual experiences into one great pool to determine what the actual premium should be to take care of these premium elements: Pure loss, claims expense, acquisition expense, home office expense, and some small percentage of profit. If they make that combination and make that filing with the State, the State then has the right in most cases, according to their individual codes, to say that that filing is satisfactory or that they disagree with it in part and the company or companies must bring in something else. The little individual insurance company could not begin to make a comprehensive filing. Under most State codes they are permitted to make a deviated filing if they care to. The States hold that the first element in an insurance policy is not rate but is financial security. If you expect, for example, to get a 10-cent rate in the State of Missouri on a given type of risk then you have to show the State that the rate is sufficient to maintain financial security; that you are able to assume a certain volume of risk, because after all the policyholders' welfare comes first. The minute you do that, under this decision of the Supreme Court, you are in violation of the Federal law of the Sherman and the Clayton Acts. The combination comes before the State supervision by the very nature of the State supervision, and so I must say that if the gentleman's bill were attached to, or substituted for this bill before the House, it would not accomplish what he or this House wants. Although his intention is good, and I agree with it, the bill in my opinion confuses.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that failure of the Congress to act promptly imperils the vast policyholders' reserves held in trust by the many insurance companies of the country. The grasping bureaucrats of this administration care nothing for the security of policyholders. They want to get their hands on the $3,606,227.06 of fire-insurance assets, the $2,825,000,000 of casualty-insurance assets, and the $37,200,000,000 of life-insurance assets, plus a total annual premium income in excess of $7,000,000,000. They would soon corrupt the entire insurance policyholder reserve.

Mr. HANCOCK Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 11 minutes.

[Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a conference report is ready for consideration. I move that the Committee do now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3270, to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carroll, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 340. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes;

H. R. 905. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the tract of land conditionally granted to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, under the act of March 24, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 1046. An act for the relief of David B. Turpel;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of J. T. Taulbee, deceased, and Mrs. Bertie Lelia Parker;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Lessie C. Selman;

H. R. 1675. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Edwin H. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 2151. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Powers Long;

H. R. 2288. An act for the relief of Donald J. Munson;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Mrs. Samuel M. McLaughlin;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Clarence P. Hale, Jr.;

H. R. 2469. An act for the relief of Anna Charack;

H. R. 2511. An act for the relief of P. Audley Whaley;

H. R. 2530. An act for the relief of John M. O'Connell;

H. R. 2605. An act for the relief of Charles W. Kirby;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, mother of Ann Timmerman, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2788. An act for the relief of Frank Baptiste;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased;

H. R. 2965. An act for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.;

H. R. 3098. An act for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of Ruth L. Clapp;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of William Dyer;

H. R. 3281. An act for the relief of the estate of Nelson Hawkins;

H. R. 3301. An act for the relief of the legal guardan of Edward Polak, a minor;

H. R. 3306. An act to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University;

H. R. 3324. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 3481. An act for the relief of J. William Ingram;

H. R. 3524. An act to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument;

H. R. 3539. An act for the relief of the estate of Carlos Pérez Avilés;

H. R. 3586. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Andrew Godwin;

H. R. 3596. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 3604. An act authorizing the appointment of the Chief of Chaplains to the temporary rank of major general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3636. An act for the relief of Josephine Guidoni;

H. R. 3649. An act for the relief of Mac Ekvall;

H. R. 3654. An act for the relief of Byron Ennis;

H. R. 3674. An act for the relief of William E. Widby;

H. R. 3724. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin;

H. R. 3737. An act for the relief of M. H. Harris;

H. R. 3739. An act for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.;

H. R. 3859. An act for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck;

H. R. 3870. An act to amend section 214 of the act of February 28, 1925;

H. R. 3976. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kee.

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4041. An act to amend the act relating to the construction and maintenance of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Nebraska City, Nebr.;

H. R. 4074. An act for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass;

H. R. 4102. An act to extend for 1 additional year the reduced rate of interest on Land Bank Commissioner loans;

H. R. 4197. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Cushman;

H. R. 4348. An act to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4361. An act for the relief of Arch A. Brown;

H. R. 4458. An act for the relief of J. G. Power and L. D. Power;

H. R. 4517. An act to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations;

H. R. 4528. An act for the relief of L. M. Feller Co. and Wendell C. Graus;

H. R. 4623. An act to authorize the use of space in the old post-office building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the Old Oregon Country held by the State for public display;

H. R. 4687. An act relating to issuance of postal notes;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of J. Fletcher Lankton and John N. Ziegele;

H. R. 4728. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 4733. An act to amend section 514 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act;

H. R. 4825. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Des Moines, Iowa, September 10 to 14, inclusive, 1944;

H. R. 4881. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code, the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to classify a new synthetic drug, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution extending the period for the acquisition by the Railroad Retirement Board of data needed in carrying out the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts; and

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution requesting the President to urge upon the governments of those countries where the cultivation of the poppy plant exists, the necessity of immediately limiting the production of opium to the amount required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4443) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4899) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14 and 19 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.

2. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 to the bill (H. R. 443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department or Administration shall be used in the fiscal year 1945 for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the War Food Administration or any of its constituent agencies shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person after it is determined by the War Food Administrator that such person has, personally or by letter, demanded that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity. Hearings on charges filed with the War Food Administrator shall be held and decision made within thirty days after such charges are filed with him"; and the Senate agree to the same.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
M. E. TYDINGS,
E. D. SMITH,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The House had inserted 2 provisos, one of which prohibited the use of funds appropriated for the Department to pay the salary of any full-time employee who engages in any political or lobbying activity, and the other of which denied the use of funds to pay the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person who demands that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.

In the conference, substitute language was adopted prohibiting the use, during the fiscal year 1945, of funds available to the Department for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person convicted of violating the so-called Hatch Act or found to have violated the provisions of the so-called anti-lobbying statute, which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

In lieu of the so-called Harness amendment, the conference agreed upon language directed against the same abuses as set forth in the original provision but denying the use of the funds appropriated for the War Food Administration for the salary and expenses of only such persons as are found, by the War Food Administrator, to have indulged in such abuses and directing that hearings on charges filed with the Administrator shall be held and decision made within 30 days after such charges are filed with him.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report just filed on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill and its immediate consideration, and in that connection I also ask that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, since the actions in the House and Senate in connection with the first conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, there has been left in disagreement only amendment numbered 60, the so-called political activities amendment. Subsequent to the last conference, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] has resigned as a member of the House conferees on account of being detained on official business which prevented his attendance upon the further conference of the House and Senate conferees.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, was appointed by the Speaker as conferee in lieu of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The conferees today have considered the matter at issue, Senate amendment numbered 60, and have unanimously agreed upon the substitute language which is included in the report of the managers which has just been read.

I do not think, in view of the fact that the agreement is unanimous both on the part of the House conferees and on the part of the Senate conferees, that extended discussion of the matter would perhaps be desired. Unless there is some Member who desires a further explanatory statement of the recommendations contained in the report, I would be inclined to move the previous question. However, if the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire time, I shall be glad to yield time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not care for any time myself, unless the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does.

Mr. TABER. I do not.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this completes the action on the agricultural appropriation bill, since the Senate has already approved the conference report. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a tabular statement showing the amount carried in the bill for all purposes as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as it was finally agreed upon in conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1945

	House bill	Senate bill	As finally passed	Conference report compared with House bill, (+) or (−)	Conference report compared with Senate bill, (+) or (−)
Total of items carried in bill exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds and corporate funds for administrative expenses	$567, 995, 779	$646, 946, 705	$644, 215, 905	+$76, 220, 126	−$2, 730, 800
Direct appropriations:					
(a) Nonreimbursable	515, 244, 192	524, 016, 718	561, 355, 918	+46, 111, 726	+37, 339, 200
(b) For loans	20, 000, 000	790, 000	790, 000	−19, 210, 000	
Total, direct appropriations	535, 244, 192	524, 806, 718	562, 145, 918	+26, 901, 726	+37, 339, 200
Transfers from permanent appropriations		90, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	+50, 000, 000	−40, 000, 000
Reappropriations	32, 751, 587	32, 139, 987	32, 069, 987	−681, 600	−70, 000
From Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds (for loans)	15, 000, 000	156, 710, 000	107, 500, 000	+92, 500, 000	−49, 210, 000
Authorizations from corporate funds for administrative expenses	13, 658, 526	15, 408, 526	15, 408, 526	+1, 750, 000	
Grand total of items carried in bill, including Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds and corporate funds for administrative expenses	596, 654, 305	819, 065, 231	[1] 767, 124, 431	+170, 470, 126	−51, 940, 800

[1] This figure compares with total 1944 appropriations for comparable items of $1,082,462,466 and total 1945 Budget estimates for this bill of $789,919,842.

Provision for loan funds in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1945

Source and class	House bill	Senate bill	Agreed to in conference [1]	Conference report compared with House bill, (+) or (−)	Conference report compared with Senate bill, (+) or (−)
From the general fund of the Treasury:					
Direct appropriations:					
Rural electrification	$20, 000, 000			−$20, 000, 000	
Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas		$790, 000	$790, 000	+790, 000	
Total	20, 000, 000	790, 000	790, 000	−19, 210, 000	
Reappropriation: Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans, Farm Credit Administration (estimated)	23, 000, 000	23, 000, 000	23, 000, 000		
Total, from general funds	43, 000, 000	23, 790, 000	23, 790, 000	−19, 210, 000	
From Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authorizations:					
Rural rehabilitation		96, 710, 000	67, 500, 000	+67, 500, 000	−$29, 210, 000
Farm tenancy	15, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	15, 000, 000		−5, 000, 000
Rural electrification		40, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	+25, 000, 000	−15, 000, 000
Total, from Reconstruction Finance Corporation	15, 000, 000	156, 710, 000	107, 500, 000	+92, 500, 000	−49, 210, 000
Grand total, loan funds	58, 000, 000	180, 500, 000	131, 290, 000	+73, 290, 000	−49, 210, 000

[1] Including items still in disagreement on basis of motions to be offered by House managers.

REGULATION OF THE INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3270) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3270, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in 11 minutes remaining, I am going to try to be helpful to the members of the committee whose duties have made it

impossible for them to be here during the general debate.

I believe it may be stated that there are two things this debate indicates we are agreed upon. One is that the decision of the Supreme Court has left the business of insurance in a very chaotic condition. There is no machinery for Federal regulation of the insurance business. The question of the power of the States to regulate insurance and the question whether or not individuals engaged in the insurance business obedient to State law are subject to Federal prosecution, make up a part of this chaotic condition.

May I say that prior to this decision of the Supreme Court the States had unlimited and sufficient power to control the business of insurance. With reference to those insurance corporations which they created, they had, of course, the power to control their respective creatures. Nobody questions that. Insurance not being regarded as interstate commerce, they could impose such conditions as they saw fit upon foreign corporations seeking to come into those States to do business.

I think it is agreed that prior to this decision, since the first decision seventy-odd years ago, the Supreme Court in an unbroken line of decisions has held that insurance is not commerce. So the business of insurance is involved and the power of the State is involved, and involved by a decision of four members of the Supreme Court, whose decision was challenged by three members of that Court.

A good deal has been said here on the floor of the House with reference to the necessity of an examination to determine what is to be done about the matter. There seems to be a general agreement that that will have to be done. Pending the putting of that machinery into operation to complete this investigation and report, the Committee on the Judiciary has brought out a bill which, in the judgment, at least of a considerable majority of that committee, does as much as the committee can do and as much as the Congress can do to hold the matter where it was before this decision was rendered. Until it can be determined, what is to be done in this disturbing situation created by the decision?

May I make an observation with reference to what I think is the most important thing involved in this whole controversy? The insurance companies can go. Your interest and my interest can disappear. But in my judgment this decision of the Supreme Court strikes at the heart of State sovereignty. The States were doing this job. They were recognized as having complete power and complete responsibility. Taking power from the States and responsibility from the States is what is destroying them. Putting that power upon the Federal Government is what is making it a great Federal bureaucracy. It can discharge this governmental overload only as a bureaucracy. If we propose to maintain democratic government in this country, we people who have been blowing about a democracy are going to have to meet this issue and begin to do it now. I do not propose to yield to the Supreme Court any power to destroy the greatest democracy that God Almighty has ever created on this earth.

At the very time when every student of American Government must recognize, if he has any sense, that we must choose between decentralizing governmental power and having government by a great Federal bureacracy, the Supreme Court in behalf of the Federal Government lays its hand on this great business concerning which the States have demonstrated an ability to control.

Say what you please, that is the issue that is involved, and in my judgment it is as great as anything we have before us.

Of course, the States are not doing this job perfectly, but I venture to say that the States, considering the difficulties of this job, have made as much progress as this great big Uncle Sam has been making in handling its business. If the fact that governmental responsibility being handled by a governmental agency is not being perfectly done is the test, we would be cleaned out up here pretty clean. The fact that the States, if they have the power, have not yet done the job perfectly is no proof, no argument, that power ought to be taken away from them, but it is a conclusive argument why that power should stay with them until they can develop the ability and the capacity to do that job well, so that they will be able to do well the bigger job before us tomorrow if we are to preserve democratic government in this country.

There is absolutely no sense in the argument made that the States cannot do the job. If a kid falls down and cannot walk as good as his daddy, is that proof that his daddy ought to tote him the rest of his life? How do people learn to do things except by doing them? How are these States ever going to learn that job unless we keep them on the job?

I am talking horse sense. Everybody who examines life knows it. Everybody knows that the difficulties which some people have been pointing their fingers at as a reason why the sovereignty of the States should be stricken are the reason why we ought to keep them there. God Almighty in His great plans has provided difficulties to develop people, and now it is proposed to take them away.

The fact is that the Supreme Court—and we have helped, too—has been stretching and stretching these provisions of the Constitution like the interstate commerce clause and the equal-protection clause, stretching them and stretching them in order to increase Federal power until they have been stretched absolutely beyond where common sense and common honesty indicate that language can be stretched. I am speaking the truth about it.

I am respectful of the courts, but it is time the judiciary begins to get back on its own side of the fence. It is not there to fix the public policy. This stretching of constitutional provisions, failing to hold the Federal Government within proper legislative bounds and governmental bounds—and that is us also—this stretching and stretching these provisions until they break, and then breaking through the barrier of precedents, established through 70 years, is sort of like a football team getting beyond all interference and running wild in an open field to any goal to which inclination may give direction.

God Almighty has imposed some natural laws that govern the business of judging. You can see those laws operate out on a football field as well as you can see them here. The business of judging is to know the rules of the game and to call them as they see them. That is judicial qualification, that is judical integrity. We have got to get on our jobs and attend to our part of the business. The judges of this country have to be governed by the rules that govern the business of judging. God Almighty has fixed those rules. They operate on the football field and they operate all the way up. Fixing policy is not the business of judges. Whenever anybody begins to shade his decision in order to throw the game where he wants it to go—well, you just go out on a football field and see what you think of the fellow that does it.

It is about time some spades were called spades in this country. The time has come when the Congress of the United States has to assume its responsibility as the spokesman of a sovereign people. We would be doing a great thing in America if in behalf of the people who sent us here we should determine that we are going to preserve the States of this country as the agents of general government. We have to do it. We used to talk about it as a matter of theory, but we are right up against it now. It is not a theory now. There is no more chance to preserve democratic government in this great country that lies between these two oceans unless we send back to the States the governmental power within their capacity, and strip this Federal Government down to Federal business. Then you will have sovereign States and statesmen of responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or in any wise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves that the Committee do now rise and report H. R. 3270 back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken therefrom.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, there has been repeated all afternoon the statement that the Supreme Court decision interferes with the right of the States to regulate insurance companies. I humbly state that that is not a fact. That de-

[PUBLIC LAW 367—78TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 296—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 4443]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Secretary, and other personal services in the Office of the Secretary in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of one and the maintenance, repair, and operation of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, $1,700,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $187,390, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to contract for stenographic reporting services, and the appropriations made in this Act shall be available for such purposes, and to expend from appropriations available for the purchase of lands not

to exceed $1 for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land: *Provided further*, That with the approval of the Secretary, employees of the Department stationed abroad may enter into leases for official quarters, for periods not exceeding one year, and may pay rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the discharge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country where custom or practice requires payment in advance: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same; *Provided further*, That, except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $1,930,632, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $340,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed $1,063,000: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $506,000, together with such amounts from

other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $251,179, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District of Columbia, $587,955; for preparation and display of exhibits, $46 625 and the preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $59,500, including cooperation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other agencies: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 from which transfers to this appropriation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein, including personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for the temporary employment, by contract or otherwise, of specialists, technicians, and experts, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $13,900 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

PRINTING AND BINDING

For all printing and binding for the Department, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere, except as otherwise in this Act provided, $1,100,000, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of the Secretary, as required by the Acts of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and in pursuance of the Act approved March 30, 1906 (44 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sec-

tions of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the Act approved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided*, That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under said section 32, and from funds appropriated for "Salaries and expenses, War Food Administration", such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with functions assigned to the Office of Information by the War Food Administrator: *Provided further*, That the total amount that may be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso shall not exceed $385,000.

LIBRARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Salaries and expenses: For purchase and exchange of reference books, lawbooks, technical and scientific books, periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to exceed $1,200 for newspapers; for dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; for salaries in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official travel expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, $543,233, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $750, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation not to exceed $369,070 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to make copies of bibliographies prepared by the Department library, microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books and other library materials in the Department and sell such bibliographies and repro

ductions at such prices (not less than estimated cost of furnishing same) as he may determine, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in cooperation with public agencies or organizations, including not to exceed $2,160,552 for personal services in the District of Columbia, including the salary of Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, as follows:

Economic investigations: For acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, for conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities of the Department, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,375,236, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for such salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $245,377 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for State and county land-use planning.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooperation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951–957), $1,500,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1945 for

such salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $175,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1945 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1945, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton: *Provided further*, That estimates of apple production shall be confined to the commercial crop.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the functions of the Secretary under the Act of June 5, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 541–545), independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, and for enabling the Secretary to discharge his functions as a member of the joint Great Britain-United States board known as the Combined Food Board, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase of such books and periodicals and not to exceed $500 for newspapers as may be necessary in connection with this work, $481,505.

INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION CONTROL COMMITTEES

Not to exceed $12,500 may be expended from the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration" and "Sugar Act" for the share of the United States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events or bodies concerned with the reduction of agricultural surpluses or with other objectives of said appropriations, together with traveling and other necessary expenses relating thereto.

EXTENSION SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO STATES; HAWAII; ALASKA; AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act

approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 589), $555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all. for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico, the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f–343g) extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $140,000; in all, Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts, $14,198,950.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration and coordination of extension work: For the employment of persons and means in the Distict of Columbia and elsewhere to enable the Secretary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341–348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, including cooperation with other bureaus and offices of the Department, and Federal, State, county, and other agencies, in the development, preparation, and distribution of educational material designed to increase the effectiveness of cooperative extension work as conducted by the Department in cooperation with land-grant colleges, $748,843, of which amount not to exceed $632,610 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Office of Administrator

Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Administrator at $9,200 per annum, and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $136,656.

Special Research Fund, Department of Agriculture

For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of an Act entitled "An Act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges", approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of section 5 of the said Act, and for special research work, including the planning, programing, coordination, and printing the results of such research, to be conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may designate or establish, and to which he may make allotments from this fund, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $1,226,364, of which amount $742,315 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for by section 4 of said Act.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377–379), $720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), $720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373–376, 380, 382), $2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427–427g), $2,463,708; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, $90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, $15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, $22,500; in all, for Alaska, $37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d–386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, $90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, $7,001,208: *Provided*, That in order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population, $63,708 of the appropriation in this paragraph under the Bankhead-Jones Act shall be available for allotment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Administration of grants and coordination of research with States: For salaries and expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, necessary to enable the Secretary to enforce the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361–363, 365–383, 386–386f), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, $176,169, of which not to exceed $166,122 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico: To enable the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and not to exceed $8,000 for the erection and alteration of buildings, $107,074; and the Secretary is author-

ized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed $712,955 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, for carrying out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts; and the Secretary, upon application of any exporter, importer, packer, or owner of, or the agent thereof, or dealer in, livestock, hides, skins, meat, or other animal products, may in his discretion, make inspections and examinations at places other than the headquarters of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence incurred for such inspections and examinations, the funds derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from which the expenses are paid; collect and disseminate information concerning livestock and animal products; prepare and disseminate reports on animal industry; purchase in the open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture, which are sold in the United States, for the detection, prevention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals, test the same, and disseminate the results of said tests in such manner as he may deem best, and purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals, including poultry, or quarantine the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, contagious poultry diseases, or other diseases of animals from one State to another, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $195,379.

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations and other agencies, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings necessary to carry on the experiments (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one building), $899,500.

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, including the alteration and construction of necessary buildings at Beltsville, Maryland (not to exceed $5,000 for the erection or alteration of any one building), and necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, $756,939: *Provided*, That fees shall be charged for all diagnoses in connection with rabies, except those performed for agencies of the United States Government, in such amounts as the Secretary shall prescribe, and such fees shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle, $5,433,232, together with not to exceed $343,959 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944: *Provided*, That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed, condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

Hog-cholera control: For the control and eradication of hog cholera and related swine diseases, by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county authorities, $115,440.

Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quarantine work, including the eradication of southern cattle ticks, scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the twenty-eight-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the mallein testing of animals, $1,003,130.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food products, including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to public printing, $9,359,124.

Virus Serum Toxin Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151–158), regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum,

toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals, $279,228.

Marketing agreements with respect to hog cholera virus and serum: The sum of $38,444 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851–855), entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to exceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided*, That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That the sum of $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $3,500,000 contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1924, approved December 5, 1924, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease and other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to enable the Secretary to control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $410,345 for personal services in the District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Acts of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c), 2327 (b)), and August 10, 1912 (26 U. S. C. 2327 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, and the Act of May 23, 1908

(21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, repairs to buildings, and not to exceed $10,000 for the construction or alteration of buildings, $812,958.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the investigation of fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton, tobacco, vegetables, grasses, forage, drug, medicinal, poisonous, fiber, and other plants and plant industries, of soils and soil-plant relationships, and of the application of engineering principles to agriculture, in cooperation with other branches of the Department, the State experiment stations, and practical farmers; for the erection or alteration of necessary farm buildings and buildings at the National Arboretum: *Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500; and for the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere required for the investigations, experiments, and demonstrations herein authorized, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $225,000.

Agricultural engineering investigations: For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture; for investigating and reporting upon the different kinds of farm power and appliances; upon farm domestic water supply and sewage disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical farm equipment and rural electrification, upon the engineering problems relating to the processing, transportation, and storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the Act approved April 19, 1930 (7 U. S. C. 424, 425); for giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural and chemical engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins, plans, and reports, $353,639, of which (notwithstanding the above limitation upon buildings) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the construction of a building at the Houma (Louisiana) station.

Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of cereal production and for the study and control of cereal diseases, for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn and methods of broomcorn production, and for determining the distribution of weeds and means for their control, $650,524.

Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: For investigation of the production of cotton and other fiber crops, including the improvement by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, fiber yield and

quality, cotton soil-fertility, and the control of diseases, $456,702, of which sum not less than $14,700 shall be used for experimenting in Sea Island cotton, including its hybridization with other varieties.

Drug and related plants: For the investigation, testing, and improvement of plants yielding drugs, spices, poisons, oils, and related products and byproducts, $70,308.

Dry-land agriculture: For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, $257,563: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment of any new field station.

Forage crops and diseases: For the investigation and improvement of forage crops, including grasses, alfalfas, clovers, soybeans, lespedezas, vetches, cowpeas, field peas, and miscellaneous legumes; for the investigation of green-manure crops and cover crops; for investigations looking to the improvement of pastures; and for the investigation of forage-crop diseases and methods of control, $327,837.

Forest pathology: For the investigation of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, including a study of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi, bacteria, viruses, and other causes of such diseases, for the purpose of developing methods of control and eradication and determining their application, $255,300.

Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: For investigation and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activities concerned with the production of fruits, nuts, vegetables, ornamentals, and related plants, for investigation of methods of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing and utilizing these products, and for studies of the physiological and related changes of such products during processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, $1,463,877.

Irrigation agriculture: For investigations of crop production on irrigable lands, the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops, and methods for improving and maintaining the productivity of irrigated soils, $145,000.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a National Arboretum, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191–194), employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and travel expenses of employees and advisory council, $31,500, of which not to exceed $2,500 may be expended by contract or otherwise for the services of consulting landscape architects without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service rules.

Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: For investigations in seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and also wild native plants, for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country, for plant-disease investigations, including nematology, and for plant and plant-disease collections and surveys, $298,913.

Plant Industry Experiment Farm: For the maintenance of a general experiment farm and agricultural station in the vicinity of Beltsville, Maryland, $56,976.

Soil and fertilizer investigations: For soil and fertilizer investigations, including soil minerals, soil organic matter, soil solution, soil physical and chemical investigations, soil microbiology, including the testing of cultures procured in the open market for inoculating legumes, other crops, or soil, and if any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or misbranded, the results of the tests may be published, together with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by whom the cultures were offered for sale; for investigations of the causes of soil infertility and the maintenance of soil productivity; and for investigations within the United States of fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, including phosphoric acid and potash, and other soil amendments, and their suitability for agricultural use, $346,791.

Soil survey: For the investigation of soils and their origin, for survey of the extent of classes and types, and for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations and surveys, $162,582.

Sugar-plant investigations: For sugar-plant investigations, including studies of diseases and the improvement of sugar beets and sugar-beet seed, sugarcane, and other sugar-producing plants, cultural and production methods, and the improvement and maintenance of soil fertility in relation to sugar plants, $370,000.

Tobacco investigations: For the investigation and improvement of tobacco and the methods of tobacco production and handling, $143,520.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses connected with investigations, experiments, and demonstrations for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for investigating and importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 146, 147, 151–167, 281, 282), to conduct other activities hereinafter authorized, and for the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, States, counties, municipalities, corporations, agencies, individuals, or with foreign governments; including the employment of necessary persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, of which not to exceed $633,886 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, rent, construction, alteration, or repair of necessary buildings outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That, unless otherwise specifically provided, the cost for the construction or alteration of any building shall not exceed $1,500 and the total amount expended for such construction in any one year shall not exceed $7,000, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general administrative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services, $160,920.

Fruit insects: For insects affecting fruits, grapes, and nuts, $457,230.

Japanese beetle control: For the control and prevention of spread of the Japanese beetle, $400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Sweetpotato weevil control: For the determination and application of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils as, in the judgment of the Secretary, may be necessary, $78,670: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

Mexican fruitfly control: For the control and prevention of spread of the Mexican fruitfly, including necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $169,820.

Gypsy and brown-tail moth control: For the control and prevention of spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths, $409.320.

Dutch elm disease control: For determining and applying methods of control and prevention of spread of the disease of elm trees known as "Dutch elm disease" and of a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley, $300,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations concerned: *Provided further*, That expenditures incurred for removal of trees from non-Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, or on property included within local experimental control areas: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication: For determining and applying such methods of eradication, control, and prevention of spread of the diseases of peach trees known as "phony peach" and "peach mosaic" as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary, including cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accom-

plish such purposes, including the certification of products out of the infested areas to meet the requirements of State quarantines, $99,340: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Forest insects: For insects affecting forests and forest products, under section 4 of the Act approved May 22, 1928 (16 U. S. C. 581c), entitled "An Act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects", and for insects affecting ornamental trees and shrubs, $202,000.

Truck crop and garden insects: For insects affecting truck crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco, sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $326,340.

Cereal and forage insects: For insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including sugarcane and rice, and including research on the European corn borer, $403,370.

Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the common barberry and for applying such other methods of eradication, control, and prevention of spread of cereal rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary may be necessary to accomplish such purposes, $283,470: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures from this appropriation shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured or destroyed.

Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $163,730.

Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $738,960.

Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and the propagation and distribution by sale of surplus bee-breeding stock, $91,950: *Provided*, That the rates at which such sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting man, household possessions, and animals, $175,000.

Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identification and classification of insects, including taxonomic, morphological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other agencies concerned with insect-pest control, $145,000.

Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in connection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods, $25,000.

Control investigations: For developing equipment or apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication and control of plant pests, determining methods of disinfecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests, determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases of insect-pest control, $76,485, of which not less than $10,000 shall be used for methyl bromide investigations.

Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the investigation and development of methods of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical problems relating to the composition, action, and application of insecticides and fungicides, $130,520.

Transit inspection: For the inspection in transit or otherwise of articles quarantined under the Act of August 20, 1912 (7 U. S. C. 161, 164a), as amended, and for the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of quarantines promulgated thereunder, $45,900.

Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export, and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of the entry into the United States of railway cars and other vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection thereof, including construction and repair of necessary buildings, plants, and equipment, for the fumigation, disinfection, or cleaning of products, railway cars, or other vehicles entering the United States from Mexico, $797,700: *Provided*, That any moneys received in payment of charges fixed by the Secretary on account of such cleaning and disinfection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Certification of exports: For the inspection, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, of domestic plants and plant products when offered for export and to certify to shippers and interested parties as to the freedom of such products from injurious plant diseases and insect pests according to the sanitary requirements of the foreign countries affected and to make such reasonable charges and to use such means as may be necessary to accomplish this object, $34,480: *Provided*, That moneys received on account of such inspection and certification shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

CONTROL OF INCIPIENT AND EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF INSECT PESTS AND PLANT DISEASES

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of and for expenditures authorized by the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), including surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, $2,700,000.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations hereinafter authorized, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Department, other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, States, State agricultural experiment stations, universities, and other State agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business, farm, or other organizations and corporations, individuals, associations, and scientific societies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, of which not to exceed $198,280 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; and for erection, alteration, and repair of buildings outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of Chief of Bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $82,250.

Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the investigations contemplated by the Act of May 15, 1862 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for such purposes; for the technological investigation of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack investigations; and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis, $313,411.

Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components; the investigation and experimental demonstration of improved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval stores; the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and utilization of naval stores; and for the assembling and compilation of data on production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin, pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), $112,100.

Regional research laboratories: For continuing the researches established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II, and subject to the provisions of section 393 of title III, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292, 1393), including research on food products of farm commodities, $4,244,600.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $290,400 for personal services in the District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics for conduct-

ing either independently or in cooperation with other agencies, investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, and for disseminating useful information on this subject, $806,630.

BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER

For general administrative purposes, including maintenance, operation, construction or alteration of necessary buildings at a cost of not to exceed $7,500, repairs, and other expenses, $130,760: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alteration, and repair performed by the Center in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by this appropriation.

WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act for forest protection against the white pine blister rust", approved April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), and in accordance with the provisions thereof, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,264,026; of which amount $203,173 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,219,900 of said amount to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $840,953 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, cooperation with individual States, local authorities and private agencies in the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed $951,611 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, and to enable the Sec-

retary to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this Act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water and including the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase lawbooks, reference and technical books, and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,500 may be expended for the contribution of the United States to the cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Union of Forest Research Stations and of the Department of Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois: *Provided further*, That the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, equipment, and materials stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Forest Service and for sale and distribution to other Government activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment, and materials, including the cost of supervision, transportation, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies and materials are procured for warehouse stocks: *Provided further*, That the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service available for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replacement of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for use of

such equipment on projects of the Forest Service chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reimbursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment management control, and credited to appropriations currently available at the time adjustment is effected: *Provided further*, That the Forest Service may rent equipment for fire-control purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time payment is received, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of the Chief Forester at $9,200 per annum, for the necessary expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), and for other personal services in the District of Columbia, $625,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract or otherwise, with authority to renew any contract for such purpose annually, not more than twice, without additional advertising; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; acceptance of moneys from timber purchasers for deposit into the Treasury in the trust account, Forest Service Cooperative Fund, which moneys are hereby appropriated and made available until expended for scaling services requested by purchasers in addition to those required by the Forest Service, and for refunds of amounts deposited in excess of the cost of such work; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the Act

of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-ways for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, including lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted under the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 521), and the Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499, 505, 564–570), lands transferred by authority of the Secretary from the Resettlement Administration to the Forest Service, and lands transferred to the Forest Service under authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, $17,729,426: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of persons who have lost their lives as a result of fighting fires while employed by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood, and other forest products the amounts made available for schools and roads by the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C. 500), and the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501), shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and unappropriated public forest lands, $100,000, which amount shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects", approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), as follows:

Forest management: Fire, silvicultural, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, at forest experiment stations or elsewhere, $506,348.

Range investigations: Investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, $288,475.

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, $1,147,519.

Forest survey: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, $156,246.

Forest economics: Investigations in forest economics under section 10, $84,018.

Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover characteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water conservation, flood control, stream-flow regulation, erosion, climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for developing preventive and control measures therefor, $86,762.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564–570), $6,300,000, of which not to exceed $71,000 and $5,000 shall be available for personal services and for the purchase of supplies and equipment, respectively, in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Secretary may authorize expenditures not to exceed $1,000,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on extremely critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $532,038) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,728), of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not to exceed $781,466, of which not to exceed $50,958 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed $30,000 for the construction, alteration, or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or

associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, of which not to exceed $20,030 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, including not to exceed $70,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $4,161,496 for forest development roads and trails, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $7,500.

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the Act of March 5, 1942, as amended (7 U. S. C. 171–175), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and periodicals; purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; erection of necessary buildings; procurement of medical supplies or services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, and furnishing to employees daily transportation between points of assembly and work projects, there is hereby continued available, in accordance with section 3 of said Act of March 5, 1942, not to exceed $3,020,985 of the unobligated balances of appropriations made under this head for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, which balances shall be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided*, That any proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or

from other sales, rentals, and fees resulting from operations under such Act of March 5, 1942, as amended, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, of persons serving while away from their permanent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by the War Food Administration, without other compensation from the United States, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $200,000; upon authorization or approval of the War Food Administrator, travel expenses to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations not to exceed $20,000, including travel in privately owned automobiles, of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed $800 for newspapers; and the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; $30,700,000: *Provided*, That the applicable appropriations available to the War Food Administration, current at the time services are rendered or payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or estimated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration, incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products, excepting walnuts, for administration of such orders: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a majority of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed $7,208,526 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation in carrying out its

activities as authorized by law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the District of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriate appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be accounted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–8); and the method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for ⅞-inch middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for ⅞-inch middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this proviso: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substantially deteriorated in quality (or in the case of perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks) or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat in the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407)

(except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, $290,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1945, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1944 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1943, to December 31, 1944, inclusive, and, in addition, $12,500,000 for making additional payments on an acreage and pound basis for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes determined by the War Food Administrator to be necessary for an adequate supply of such seeds: *Provided*, That, excepting the foregoing item of $12,500,000, no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the "1944 Agricultural Conservation Program" bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $24,250,000 of said amount shall be available until June 30, 1945, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not more than $7,917,360 of the $8,667,360 provided in the schedule in the Budget hereunder for 1945 for transfer to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency", shall be so transferred: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1945 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000, including the value of seeds, fertilizers, and other conservation materials remaining on hand at the close of the 1944 program and to be used as grants under the 1945 program; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State Committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States: *Provided further*, That no part of such amounts shall be available after June 30, 1945, for salaries and other administrative expenses except for

payment of obligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1945: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1944, 1945, and 1946 programs under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for such materials, or services, and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1944 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of said Act of February 29, 1936, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers: *Provided further*, That the War Food Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments on Irish potatoes and commercial truck crops for fresh consumption under the 1943 Agricultural Conservation Program with respect to any farm if the War Food Administration determines that the producer would have been eligible for such payments except for the failure of such producer, because of negligence of an officer or agent of the Federal Government, to file on or before June 30, 1943, Form ACP–140, and such payments shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 32 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774): *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department or Administration shall be used in the fiscal year 1945 for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the War Food Administration or any of its constituent agencies shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person after it is determined by the War Food Administrator that such person has, personally or by letter, demanded that a farmer join the triple A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.

Hearings on charges filed with the War Food Administrator shall be held and decision made within thirty days after such charges are filed with him.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, there is hereby reappropriated not to exceed $350,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

To carry out the provisions of an Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes", approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and moisture conservation to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other agencies, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not to exceed $1,089,837 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase of books and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this Act shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Provided further*,

That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and moisture conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, $1,225,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and moisture, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of erosion nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $28,340,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than three fiscal years.

Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For research and demonstration work in soil conservation control measures, including research and demonstration work in fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $72,248: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida, or a political subdivision thereof, for the same purposes.

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $1,250,000.

EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Not exceeding $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the

making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further*, That benefits under this section to schools or child-care centers shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school or child-care center as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further*, That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25 per centum limitation contained in this section: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 per centum of the funds made available under this amendment shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds used in any State during any fiscal year under this paragraph shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the State and local school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers or agencies having control thereof.

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including the employment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as authorized by said Act, $52,510,203, to remain available until June 30, 1946.

MARKETING SERVICE

For the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere (including not to exceed $1,408,617 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia) as may be necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, either independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, $1,271,290.

Market inspection of farm products: For enabling the Secretary, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, or other associations of businessmen or trade organizations, and persons or corporations engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions, to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the class, quality, and condition of cotton, tobacco, fruits, and vegetables, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That officers and employees who, under proper authorization, use privately owned motor vehicles in the performance of official travel within the corporate limits of their official stations for the purpose of inspecting and grading farm and food products and the supervision thereof at points located within the said corporate limits may be reimbursed for such travel at a rate not to exceed 3 cents per mile: *Provided further*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the Departments shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, $547,679.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, and for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), $451,500: *Provided*, That samples, illustrations, practical forms, or sets of the grades recommended or promulgated by the Secretary for farm or food products may be sold under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the receipts therefrom deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of an Act

entitled "An Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for other purposes", approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), and an Act entitled "An Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department of Agriculture", approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501–508), as amended, $933,500.

Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency, and Standard Container Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, approved June 10, 1930, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a–499r), and the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491–497), the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes, approved May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i), $210,000.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing him to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), including such means as may be necessary for effectuating agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution, inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies thereof under such agreements, $1,210,783.

United States Grain Standards Act: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, $860,999.

United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $533,930.

Federal Seed Act: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds; and for other purposes", approved August 9, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 1561–1610), $117,700: *Provided*, That not to exceed $250 of this amount may be used for meeting the share of the United States in the expenses of the International Seed Testing Congress in carrying out plans for correlating the work of the various adhering governments on problems relating to seed analysis or other subjects which the Congress may determine to be necessary in the interest of international seed trade.

Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the provisions of

the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August 15, 1921, as amended by the Act of August 14, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 181–229), $418,700.

Naval Stores Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Naval Stores Act of March 3, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 91–99), $34,728.

Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121–134), entitled "An Act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes", $215,208.

Commodity Exchange Act: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1–17a), and as further amended by the Act of October 9, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 2), $348,797.

Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), $78,762.

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws, (2) loans to needy individual farmers, (3) grants, and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $26,000,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $57,000 for compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenanace of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under his supervision, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the

claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $67,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at not to exceed the rate of 3 per centum per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 per centum of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this Act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agricultural commodities.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1945 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said Act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said Act, $1,500,000.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $15,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said Act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes", approved August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), including the exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, $1,025,000, of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $2,550,000.

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $25,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said Act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Administration in the District of Columbia and the field, including printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority attending meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $750 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic reporting services; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $10,000 for purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by personal service without regard to the provisions of any other Act; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $10,000; not to exceed $10,000 for employment of persons,

firms, and others for the performance of special services, including legal services; necessary administrative expenses in connection with the making of loans under the provisions of the Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans made under the provisions of said Act and similar Acts administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating to loans for crop production, feed, seed, and harvesting; examination of corporations, banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration: *Provided*, That hereafter the expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such examinations shall be assessed against the said corporations, banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of existing laws except that the amounts collected from the Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916, as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administration shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administration of the administrative supervision of the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations for each fiscal year and shall apportion the amount so determined among such banks and corporations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which fund is hereby made available to said Administration for expenditure for the purposes set forth in its annual appropriation: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable after June 30 of each fiscal year said Administration shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the cost of the examination services rendered during such fiscal year to each Federal land bank, joint stock land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2) the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit bank, and production credit corporation as the cost during such fiscal year of their administrative supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case is greater than the total amount collected from the bank or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation entitled thereto; in all, $626,321, together with not to exceed $4,459,480 from the funds made available to the Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o).

Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans: For loans to farmers under the Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o), as amended by the Acts of February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1), July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), the unobligated balance (exclusive of the amount of such balance made available for "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Administration, 1945") of the appropriation "Crop production and harvesting loans" as made in the First

Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (Act of February 9, 1937, Public Law 4), and as continued available by the Acts of February 4, 1938 (Public Resolution 78), June 30, 1939 (Public Law 159), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n–1), July 1, 1941 (Public Law 144), July 22, 1942 (Public Law 674), and July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129), is hereby made available, together with all collections of principal and interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made under said Act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i–1020n, 1020o).

FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $8,200,000 of the funds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h), shall be available during the fiscal year 1945 for administrative expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses of officers and employees of the Corporation, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $250 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes; rent in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services; use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by said Act of January 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That all expenditures which under the accounting system prescribed for the Corporation by the General Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments, increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real estate and chattel), shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Act of January 31, 1934, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or of any such bureau, office, agency,

service, corporation, institution, or association to make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the provisions of food production financing bulletins F–1 or F–2, issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loans Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the applicant represents in writing and it is administratively determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the production of the crops or livestock specified in the application is not available to him from sources other than the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from other sources only on such terms and conditions that he could not use the other credit available to the extent necessary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or livestock specified in his application and (b) the person authorized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity of the crops or livestock specified in the application would be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins F–1 and F–2 made or approved on the conditions specified in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated as a region in which the making of such loans or advances is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such region: *Provided*, That none of the limitations provided for by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing the completion of production undertaken before July 12, 1943, or for the purpose of protecting or preserving the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of any loan or advance made or approved before such date.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed 7 per centum of the foregoing amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included within the general expenses of such bureau, division, or office, but no more than 7 per centum shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency.

SEC. 4. During the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made the head of any department or independent establishment of the Government requiring inspections, analyses, and tests of food and other products, within the scope of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and which that Department is unable to perform within the limits of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the Department for direct expenditure such sums as may be necessary for the performance of such work.

SEC. 5. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-

carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That such vehicles shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of motortrucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided further*, That the funds available to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency may be used for the maintenance, repair, and operation of one passenger-carrying vehicle in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; (3) employment on the emergency rubber project; (4) employment by the Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed twenty junior engineer trainees who are citizens of other American republics; and (5) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 8. If at any time during the fiscal year 1945 the termination of the Act entitled "An Act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service", approved April 9, 1943,

or of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1943, shall be fixed by concurrent resolution of the Congress at a date earlier than June 30, 1945, the appropriations contained in this Act shall cease to be available on such earlier date for obligation for the purposes of the terminated Act and the unobligated portions of appropriations allocated for the purposes of such terminated Act shall not be obligated for any other purposes of the appropriation during the fiscal year 1945.

SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945".

Approved June 28, 1944.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

July 1, 1944

BUDGET AND FINANCE CIRCULAR 764

Tables of Appropriations, 1945

For your information and for reference purposes, two tables are attached, showing appropriations of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1943, 1944 and 1945. Table I is a summary of appropriations. In Table II the appropriations and subappropriations are shown in the order in which they appear in the 1945 Agricultural Appropriation Act.

Funds for overtime compensation in 1945 were included in the annual Agricultural Appropriation Act under each item of appropriation. However, supplemental appropriations for overtime compensation carried in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944 were made on a main-head appropriation basis, with a delegation of authority to the Secretary and the War Food Administrator to distribute such funds to the various subappropriations; Table II reflects the distributions thus made.

W. A. Jump
Budget Officer

Attachments

Index entry:
BUDGETING, Appropriations,
tables of, for 1945

TABLE I

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Summary of Appropriations, Fiscal Years 1943, 1944, and 1945

Note: Figures in 1943 and 1944 columns are adjusted on basis of appropriation set-up in 1945 Act

Items	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
Appropriated Funds:			
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	$444,470,242	$400,000,000	$302,500,000
Parity payments	5,386,958	170,281,000	- -
Farm labor program a/.....	26,100,000	30,000,000	- -
Sugar Act	47,356,447	63,883,060	52,510,203
Federal Crop Insurance Act ...	8,327,912	3,500,000	350,000
Soil Conservation Service	23,811,516	23,845,136	29,637,248
Land utilization program (Title III, Farm Tenant Act)	1,523,162	1,276,120	1,250,000
Payments to counties from submarginal land program	61,500	75,196	112,100
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation	42,174,743	30,500,000	26,000,000
Farm tenancy (Title I, Farm Tenant Act)	1,491,860	1,514,070	1,500,000
Liquidation and management of resettlement projects (Title IV, Farm Tenant Act)	427,126	421,039	- -
Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas	161,310	1,025,000	1,025,000
Flood and windstorm loans and grants	- -	15,000,000	12,000,000
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (Sec. 32)	175,261,332	97,051,938	119,307,108
Marketing Service	6,845,784	6,950,600	7,233,576
Extension Service	19,505,018	19,622,503	19,652,503
War Food Administration ((Salaries and expenses)	482,000	26,200,000	30,700,000
Subtotal, above items	803,386,910	891,145,622	603,777,738
Farm Credit Administration:			
Salaries and expenses	2,362,729	689,259	626,321
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans	32,546,230	35,293,604	28,355,043
Orchard rehabilitation loans	400,000	- -	- -

a/ Available through first half of fiscal year 1945.

Items	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
Appropriated Funds (Contd.):			
Rural Electrification Administration:			
Salaries and expenses	$3,007,083	$2,558,000	$2,550,000
Loans (RFC funds provided for 1943 and 1945)	- -	20,000,000	- -
Agricultural Research Administration	41,771,535	43,049,150	44,867,348
Incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases	3,722,000	- -	2,700,000
White pine blister rust control	2,001,000	2,100,000	2,264,026
Forest Service	24,090,681	31,155,870	31,969,065
Forest fire deficiency	1,719,300	1,535,000	- -
Forest roads and trails	6,965,335	4,278,723	4,161,496
Emergency rubber project	19,000,000	13,048,000	3,020,985
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	344,195	473,670	481,505
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	3,585,932	3,881,502	3,875,236
Office of the Secretary	1,763,588	1,648,184	1,700,000
Office of Solicitor	1,872,433	1,875,105	1,930,632
Office of Information	1,846,038	1,689,257	1,606,000
Reproduction of 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture	- -	178,000	- -
Library	508,407	542,932	543,233
Working Capital Fund	- -	400,000	- -
Subtotal, above items	147,506,486	164,306,256	130,650,890
Total, appropriations and reappropriations	950,893,396	1,055,541,918	734,428,628
Deduct reappropriations included in foregoing	90,642,362	31,647,886	44,069,987
Total, direct appropriations	860,251,034	1,023,894,032	690,358,641
Administrative expenses authorized from Corporation funds:			
Commodity Credit Corporation	4,369,398	5,405,000	7,208,526
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	9,050,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
Total, administrative expenses from Corporation funds	13,419,398	13,605,000	15,408,526

Items	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
Borrowings authorized from RFC for loan activities:			
Rural electrification (appropriated funds provided for 1944)	$10,000,000	- -	$25,000,000
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation	97,500,000	67,500,000	67,500,000
Farm tenancy	32,500,000	30,000,000	15,000,000
Total, borrowings authorized from RFC	140,000,000	97,500,000	107,500,000
GRAND TOTAL, APPROPRIATIONS AND REAPPROPRIATIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES FROM CORPORATION FUNDS, AND RFC LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS	1,104,312,794	1,166,646,918	857,337,154
Trust funds	145,398,024	12,315,150	10,144,950
GRAND TOTAL, INCLUDING TRUST FUNDS	1,249,710,818	1,178,962,068	867,482,104

Prepared by:
Office of Budget and Finance
Division of Estimates and Allotments
Estimates Section
July 1, 1944.

TABLE II

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Appropriations, Fiscal Years 1943, 1944, and 1945

Note: Figures in brackets [] not included in totals; 1943 and 1944 columns are adjusted on basis of appropriation set-up in 1945 Act

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY	$1,763,588	$1,648,184	a/ $1,700,000
WORKING CAPITAL FUND	- -	400,000	- -
OFFICE OF SOLICITOR	1,872,433	1,875,105	a/ 1,930,632
OFFICE OF INFORMATION:			
Salaries and expenses	546,038	489,257	506,000
Printing and binding	1,300,000	1,200,000	1,100,000
Reproduction of 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture	- -	178,000	- -
Total	1,846,038	1,867,257	a/ 1,606,000
LIBRARY	508,407	542,932	543,233
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS:			
Economic investigations	2,365,306	2,373,236	2,375,236
Crop and livestock estimates	1,220,626	1,508,266	1,500,000
Total	3,585,932	3,881,502	a/ 3,875,236
OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS	b/ 344,195	473,670	481,505
EXTENSION SERVICE:			
Payments to States:			
Capper-Ketcham Act	1,480,000	1,480,000	1,480,000
Bankhead-Jones Act, Section 21, Title II	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Additional extension work	555,000	555,000	555,000
Alaska	23,950	23,950	23,950
Puerto Rico	100,000	140,000	140,000
Cooperative agricultural extension work (permanent appropriation)	4,704,710	4,704,710	4,704,710
Total, payments to States	18,863,660	18,903,660	18,903,660

a/ Provides changes in working funds available for 1945 as compared to 1944 (by direct appropriation and transfer), as follows: Office of the Secretary, $+16,460; Office of Solicitor, $+86,483; Office of Information, $-90,757; and Bureau of Agricultural Economics, $+8,884. (The estimated transfers for 1945 may be subject to some adjustment).

b/ Includes $100,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
EXTENSION SERVICE (Contd.):			
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration and coordination of extension work	$641,358	$718,843	$748,843
Total	19,505,018	19,622,503	19,652,503
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION:			
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR	103,465	117,449	136,656
SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND	1,134,130	1,189,497	1,226,364
OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS:			
Payments to States:			
Hatch Act	720,000	720,000	720,000
Adams Act	720,000	720,000	720,000
Purnell Act	2,880,000	2,880,000	2,880,000
Bankhead-Jones Act, Title I	2,463,708	2,463,708	2,463,708
Hawaii	67,500	90,000	90,000
Alaska	25,000	37,500	37,500
Puerto Rico	50,000	90,000	90,000
Total, payments to States	6,926,208	7,001,208	7,001,208
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration of grants and coordination of research with States	162,758	169,936	176,169
Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico	94,489	108,074	107,074
Total, salaries and expenses	257,247	278,010	283,243
Total	7,183,455	7,279,218	7,284,451
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY:			
General administrative expenses	173,165	188,179	195,379
Animal husbandry	801,970	885,000	899,500
Diseases of animals	708,030	734,959	756,939
Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease:			
Direct appropriation	3,573,869	5,983,800	a/ 5,433,232
Reappropriation	2,463,331	- -	343,959
Hog-cholera control	102,000	115,288	a/ 115,440
Inspection and quarantine	944,500	1,010,056	a/ 1,003,130
Meat inspection	b/ 7,697,000	8,190,898	a/ 9,359,124
Virus Serum Toxin Act	229,918	264,815	a/ 279,228
Total	16,693,783	17,372,995	18,385,931

a/ These figures include, in total, $995,384 for the reclassification of veterinarians and lay assistants to their appropriate salary grades and levels.

b/ Includes $680,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
GRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (Contd.):			
BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY	$756,617	$805,720	$812,958
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING:			
General administrative expenses:	212,709	225,000	225,000
Agricultural engineering investigations	a/ 348,333	b/ 293,478	353,639
Cereal crops and diseases	650,781	660,556	650,524
Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases	446,355	466,069	456,702
Drug and related plants ..	65,890	70,191	70,308
Dry-land agriculture	234,788	257,563	257,563
Forage crops and diseases	358,500	315,424	327,837
Forest pathology	258,460	263,765	255,300
Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases	1,430,539	1,409,978	1,463,877
Irrigation agriculture ...	146,220	142,260	145,000
National Arboretum	54,892	42,900	31,500
Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys ...	302,403	306,460	298,913
Plant Industry Experiment Farm	51,109	56,900	56,976
Soil and fertilizer investigations	337,251	354,030	346,791
Soil survey	208,430	173,095	162,582
Sugar-plant investigations	369,725	371,980	370,000
Tobacco investigations ...	126,950	122,520	143,520
Total	5,603,335	5,532,169	5,616,032
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE:			
Salaries and expenses:			
General administrative expenses	156,600	160,820	160,920
Fruit insects	414,830	441,265	457,230
Japanese beetle control	408,475	417,970	400,000
Sweetpotato weevil control	71,585	78,454	78,670
Mexican fruitfly control	163,740	159,991	169,820
Citrus canker eradication	10,160	11,110	- -
Gypsy and brown-tail moth control	c/ 413,670	407,600	409,320

a/ Includes $30,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.

b/ Includes $20,000 appropriated in a prior year, continued available in 1944 for completion of a water tower fire protection system at the U.S. Cotton Ginning Laboratory, Stoneville, Mississippi.

c/ Excludes $137,400 appropriated by the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, since the funds were never available for obligation due to fact the Act was passed after close of the fiscal year 1943.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (Contd.):			
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE (Contd.):			
Salaries and expenses (Contd.)			
Dutch elm disease eradication	$363,775	$391,984	$300,000
Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication	92,190	99,790	99,340
Forest insects	206,780	172,212	202,000
Truck crop and garden insects	339,020	324,340	326,340
Cereal and forage insects	393,995	401,895	403,370
Barberry eradication	196,970	258,150	283,470
Cotton insects	150,939	159,500	163,730
Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control	483,135	640,100	738,960
Bee culture	81,500	91,783	91,950
Insects affecting man and animals	175,105	181,585	175,000
Insect-pest survey and identification	148,600	151,424	145,000
Foreign parasites	20,775	22,277	25,000
Control investigations	66,585	75,785	76,485
Insecticide and fungicide investigations	124,515	130,135	130,520
Transit inspection	44,335	46,190	45,900
Foreign plant quarantines	782,350	801,812	797,700
Certification of exports	32,810	35,213	34,480
Total, salaries and expenses	5,342,439	5,661,385	5,715,205
Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases	a/ 3,722,000	b/ - -	2,700,000
Total	9,064,439	5,661,385	8,415,205
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY:			
General administrative expenses	73,330	73,330	82,250
Agricultural chemical investigations	280,411	278,317	313,411
Naval-stores investigations	118,456	115,100	112,100
Regional research laboratories	3,942,500	3,996,490	4,244,600
Total	4,414,697	4,463,237	4,752,361

a/ Appropriated in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943.

b/ Unobligated balance of $3,311,122 of a 1943 supplemental appropriation (on a control year basis) is available for 1944.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION (Contd.):			
BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS	a/ $426,759	$512,420	$806,630
BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER ...	112,855	115,060	130,760
WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL:			
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	782,000	831,093	840,953
Forest Service	1,044,000	1,098,160	1,219,900
Department of the Interior	175,000	170,747	203,173
Total	2,001,000	2,100,000	2,264,026
FOREST SERVICE:			
Salaries and expenses:			
General administrative expenses	597,088	642,670	625,000
National forest protection and management	13,581,730	b/ 17,561,385	c/ 18,325,426
Fighting forest fires	100,000	100,000	100,000
Forest management	560,583	456,563	506,548
Range investigations	265,265	287,369	288,475
Forest products	1,053,121	1,083,341	1,147,519
Forest survey	208,438	158,559	156,246
Forest economics	122,183	85,054	84,018
Forest influences	141,837	86,956	86,762
Total, salaries and expenses	16,630,245	20,461,897	21,319,794
Forest fire cooperation	3,994,210	6,330,000	6,300,000
Farm and other private forestry cooperation	810,442	771,168	781,466
Acquisition of lands for national forests	294,862	100,000	75,000
Forest fire deficiency.....	d/ 1,719,300	e/ 1,535,000	- -
Payments to States and territories from national forests fund (permanent appropriation)	1,670,043	2,475,655	2,475,655
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico, national forests fund (permanent appropriation)	23,392	26,888	26,888
Roads and trails for States, national forests fund (permanent appropriation)	667,487	990,262	990,262
Total	25,809,981	32,690,870	31,969,065

a/ Includes $20,000 appropriated in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.
b/ Includes $145,000 provided in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944.
c/ Includes $596,000 appropriated in Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944.
d/ Appropriated in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943.
e/ Appropriated in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS:			
Direct appropriation	$6,965,335	$3,037,168	$4,161,496
Reappropriation	- -	1,241,555	- -
Total	6,965,335	4,278,723	4,161,496
EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT (Reappropriation in 1945)	a/ 19,000,000	13,048,000	b/ 3,020,985
WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION:			
Salaries and expenses	c/ 482,000	26,200,000	30,700,000
FARM LABOR PROGRAM	d/ 26,100,000	d/ 30,000,000	- -
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION:			
Administrative expenses from Corporation funds	e/ [4,369,398]	f/ [5,405,000]	[7,208,526]
CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES	444,470,242	400,000,000	302,500,000
PARITY PAYMENTS:			
Direct appropriation	- -	170,281,000	- -
Reappropriation	5,386,958	- -	- -
Total	5,386,958	g/ 170,281,000	- -
FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT:			
Administrative and operating expenses	8,327,912	3,500,000	h/ 350,000

a/ Appropriated in Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943. In addition, $8,282,442 available in 1943 from funds appropriated in 1942.

b/ In addition, an estimated $2,399,015 of the 1944 appropriation will be available making a total of $5,420,000 for the fiscal year 1945.

c/ Appropriated in First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, for the former Office for Agricultural War Relations

d/ 1943 appropriation available through December 31, 1943; 1944 appropriation merged with 1943 fund, and entire appropriation thus merged is available through December 31, 1944.

e/ Includes $625,000 authorized by the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.

f/ Includes $250,000 authorized by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944.

g/ Appropriation in 1944 was to liquidate obligations incurred under the authorization therefor in the 1943 Act; no provision was made for continuation of the parity payment programs beyond the crop year 1942.

h/ Reappropriation of portion of 1944 unobligated balance for continuing liquidation of the program.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE:			
Soil conservation research	$1,425,543	$1,237,741	$1,225,000
Soil conservation operations	22,310,325	22,528,803	28,340,000
Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida	75,648	78,592	72,248
Total	23,811,516	23,845,136	29,637,248
LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND (TITLE III, FARM TENANT ACT)	1,523,162	1,276,120	1,250,000
Payments to counties from submarginal land program (permanent appropriation)	61,500	75,196	112,100
EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES:			
Permanent appropriation, Section 32	a/ 131,429,833	a/ 97,051,938	a/119,307,108
Reappropriation	43,831,499	- -	- -
Total	175,261,332	97,051,938	119,307,108
SUGAR ACT	47,356,447	63,883,060	52,510,203
MARKETING SERVICE:			
General administrative expenses	31,000	- -	- -
Market news service	1,234,655	1,215,938	1,271,290
Market inspection of farm products	502,837	546,679	547,679
Marketing farm products	400,450	440,690	451,500
Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts	866,000	870,954	933,500
Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency and Standard Container Acts	196,435	203,939	210,000
Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts	1,100,938	1,188,683	1,210,783
United States Grain Standards Acts	828,358	860,999	860,999
United States Warehouse Act	496,830	531,541	533,930
Federal Seed Act	91,690	93,750	117,700
Packers and Stockyards Act	408,044	421,212	418,700
Naval Stores Act	35,800	34,728	34,728
Insecticide Act	186,715	192,906	215,208
Commodity Exchange Act	466,032	348,581	348,797
Freight rates for farm products b/	- -	- -	78,762
Total	6,845,784	6,950,600	7,233,576

a/ Represents, for fiscal years 1943, 1944, and 1945, 30 percent of customs receipts for calendar years 1941, 1942, and 1943, respectively, 1944 and 1945 Acts authorize use of not to exceed $50,000,000 for a school lunch and milk program.
b/ Financed in 1943 and 1944 from "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources."

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriation 1945
LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION:			
Direct appropriation	$37,174,743	a/ $30,500,000	$26,000,000
Reappropriation	5,000,000	- -	- -
Total	42,174,743	30,500,000	26,000,000
Loans (RFC funds)	[97,500,000]	a/[67,500,000]	[67,500,000]
FARM TENANCY (TITLE I, FARM TENANT ACT):			
Salaries and expenses	1,491,860	1,514,070	1,500,000
Loans (RFC funds)	[32,500,000]	[30,000,000]	[15,000,000]
LIQUIDATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS (TITLE IV, FARM TENANT ACT)	427,126	421,039	b/ - -
WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS	161,310	1,025,000	1,025,000
FLOOD AND WINDSTORM LOANS AND GRANTS	- -	c/ 15,000,000	c/12,000,000
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION:			
Administrative expenses	3,007,083	2,558,000	2,550,000
Loans:			
RFC funds	[10,000,000]	- -	[25,000,000]
Appropriated funds	- -	20,000,000	- -
Total	3,007,083	22,558,000	2,550,000

a/ Includes amounts provided in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, as follows: Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation, $6,500,000, and Loans (RFC funds), $7,500,000.

b/ Necessary liquidation and management expenses will be financed from trust funds and from "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation."

c/ Appropriated for 1944 in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, for flood restoration loans; Public Law 307, 78th Congress, extended the availability of the fund to June 30, 1945, and authorized its use for flood and windstorm loans and grants.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION: a/			
Salaries and expenses:			
Direct appropriation	$2,362,729	$689,259	$626,321
Transfer from farmers' crop production and harvesting loans	[3,617,148]	[4,123,561]	[4,459,480]
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans:			
Direct appropriation	- -	4,907,273	- -
Reappropriation:			
Unobligated balances from prior years	11,441,803	10,386,331	8,355,043
Estimated collections to be available	21,104,427	20,000,000	20,000,000
Total	34,908,959	35,982,863	28,981,364
FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION: b/			
Administrative expenses from Corporation funds	[9,050,000]	c/ [8,200,000]	[8,200,000]
ORCHARD REHABILITATION LOANS (Reappropriation)	d/ 400,000	- -	- -
TOTAL, APPROPRIATIONS AND REAPPROPRIATIONS	950,893,396	1,055,541,918	734,428,628

a/ Appropriation of $24,800,000 for 1943 and $21,800,000 for 1944 made to Treasury Department for payments to Federal land banks on account of reductions in interest rate on mortgages.

b/ Appropriation of $9,000,000 for 1943 and $7,400,000 for 1944 made to Treasury Department for payments to Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation on account of reductions in interest rates on mortgages.

c/ Includes $378,000 authorized by Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944.

d/ Reappropriated by Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.

Bureau and Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
DEDUCT REAPPROPRIATIONS INCLUDED IN FOREGOING:			
Parity payments	$5,652,901	- -	- -
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities	44,497,745	- -	- -
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation	5,000,000	- -	- -
Farm Credit Administration, Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans:			
Unobligated balances from prior years	11,523,958	$10,386,331	$8,355,043
Estimated collections to be available	21,104,427	20,000,000	20,000,000
Orchard rehabilitation loans	400,000	- -	- -
Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease (Animal Industry)	2,463,331	- -	343,959
Forest roads and trails	- -	1,241,555	- -
Emergency rubber project	- -	- -	3,020,985
Federal Crop Insurance Act	- -	- -	350,000
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering	- -	20,000	- -
Flood and windstorms loans and grants	- -	- -	12,000,000
Total, deductions as above	90,642,362	31,647,886	44,069,987
TOTAL, DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS	a/ 860,251,034	1,023,894,032	690,358,641
Administrative expenses authorized from Corporation funds--listed above but not included in totals	13,419,398	13,605,000	15,408,526
Borrowings authorized from RFC for loan activities--listed above but not included in totals	140,000,000	97,500,000	107,500,000
GRAND TOTAL, APPROPRIATIONS AND REAPPROPRIATIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES FROM CORPORATION FUNDS, AND RFC LOAN AUTHORIZATION (Excluding trust funds)	1,104,312,794	1,166,646,918	857,337,154

a/ Excludes $137,400 appropriated for gypsy and brown-tail moth control in Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, since funds were not available for obligation before the close of the fiscal year.

Item	Appropriations 1943	Appropriations 1944	Appropriations 1945
TRUST FUNDS (1944 and 1945 figures are subject to revision):			
Cooperative Work, Forest Service	$2,357,542	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
Agricultural Adjustment Agency:			
Moisture content and grade determinations for C.C.C.	472,611	1,517,300	1,350,000
Indemnity fund, county associations	118	350	350
Undistributed cotton price adjustment payments	1,647	1,000	1,000
Office of Distribution:			
Expenses and refunds, inspection and grading of farm products	2,197,174	2,200,000	2,200,000
Grading of agricultural commodities for C.C.C.	215,000	433,000	250,000
Redemption of order stamps	132,697,902	- -	- -
Farm Security Administration:			
Payments in lieu of taxes and for operation and maintenance of resettlement projects	1,283,039	783,400	250,000
State rural rehabilitation corporation funds	6,061,269	5,000,000	3,800,000
Liquidation of deposits, reserve for maintenance and repair, lease and purchase agreements	3,765	4,000	2,500
Liquidation of deposits, lease and purchase contracts	29,000	125,000	40,000
Miscellaneous contributed funds ..	77,975	250,000	250,000
Return of excess deposits for reproduction of photographs, mosaics, and maps	924	1,000	1,000
Unearned fees and other charges, unclaimed moneys, etc.	58	100	100
Total, trust funds	145,398,024	12,315,150	10,144,950
GRAND TOTAL, INCLUDING TRUST FUNDS	1,249,710,818	1,178,962,068	867,482,104

Prepared by: Office of Budget and Finance
Division of Estimates and Allotments
Estimates Section
July 1, 1944